1-1-2008

Differences between European and Lebanese Americans' values about marriage.

Bilal M. Ghandour
University of Massachusetts Amherst

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EUROPEAN AND LEBANESE AMERICANS' VALUES ABOUT MARRIAGE.

A Doctoral Dissertation

by

BILAL M GHANDOUR

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts, Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

September 2008

Department of Psychology

DEDICATION

To my wife and son. Geena, you are the most wonderful marital partner. Ramy, you are my joy and pride.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank Maureen Perry Jenkins for being such a wonderful advisor. I am very grateful for her sharp advice, relentless effort to improve this work, and her ability to step back and look at this piece objectively when I struggled with my own biases. Maureen, you are amazing!

I would also like to thank my committee members - Sanjiv Gupta, Paula Pietromonaco, and Aline Sayer - for their very helpful feedback and suggestions. Paula, I want to thank you in particular for 'taking a chance on me' when we first communicated in 2000.

I will also be forever grateful to James Averill whose words of wisdom throughout this lengthy - and sometimes grueling – process called grad school will always remain in the back of my mind. Jim, your heart and mind are limitless!

I am also thankful for the support and friendship of my colleagues and friends who have stood by me in good times and tough ones. I particularly think of Kelly Jones, Cara Segal, and Jim Tyler. I am also deeply grateful to Kara Kritis Harper, who held my hand and let it go in the most effective of ways.

My thanks also go to my research assistants, Sofiya Penek, Jennifer Villemaire and Cristina deWeese, who were willing to travel long distances to odd places during a data collection stage that had numerous twists and turns.

Last but not least, I would like to thank teachers and supervisors who have played a role in helping me grow and become a better student.

ABSTRACT

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EUROPEAN AND LEBANESE AMERICANS' VALUES ABOUT MARRIAGE.

SEPTEMBER 2008

BILAL M. GHANDOUR, B.A., AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

M.S., AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Maureen Perry-Jenkins

Drawing upon the emerging literature that examines differences in values about marriage, this study examined how broader cultural values of western societies, based in individualism, and eastern societies, based in collectivism, shape values about marriage. In comparing the marital value system of European Americans with that of Lebanese or Lebanese-Americans, a theory of cultural identity was utilized. While Americans were expected to value the self-reflective aspect of marriage, which nuclearizes marriage around the husband-wife relationship, the Lebanese were expected to value the familial aspect of marriage, which views the union as a relational entity, the value of which is closely connected to that of the family system. Using a Q sort technique – a method of rank ordering a set of statements about values of interest – two factors were extrapolated, indicating two distinct sets of values regarding marriage. The first cluster of individuals (Factor I) consisted of two thirds of the Americans sample and a quarter of the Lebanese sample. The second cluster (Factor II) consisted of a majority of the Lebanese and a single American participant. As hypothesized, the values highlighted in

the first factor, or 'western'-driven factor, focused on romance; the endorsement of physical and psychological intimacy; and the belief that marriage is a private enterprise that only takes account of the marital values of the couple (i.e., 'couple' individualism). Also as hypothesized, the beliefs highlighted by the second factor, or Lebanese factor, focused on values such as psychological intimacy more than physical closeness as well as the importance of family, in particular their own parents, to marriage. Also important to this group was the endorsement of romanticism, particularly the idea of soul mate as marital partner. Demographic characteristics of the Lebanese sample indicated that education was a determining feature for distinguishing factor loadings. Specifically, we found that the Lebanese who loaded on the 'western'-driven factor were significantly more educated than their compatriots who loaded on the 'Lebanese' factor. With regards to gender, both a Q sort and ANOVA analysis found no differences within nationality or between nationalities, disconfirming previous research that American women are more communal (i.e., more 'eastern') than American men; and that women immigrants adopt the host cultures' values more readily than their male counterparts when such country provides more opportunity. Finally, we recommended that the development of a marital quality scale for Arabs in general should include items that reflect the values found in this study to be important to the majority of the Lebanese in addition to the traditionally 'western' items that were found to also be of value to this population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Study Rationale

The union between two persons in the form of a marriage is one of the most significant events in life. There is evidence that marital unions have existed for at least 5000 years (Coontz, 2004), casting little doubt that the propensity to marry is one of the most enduring aspects of socialization. Despite its ubiquitous presence, it was only in the mid-twentieth century that American researchers began to take serious interest in studying marriage, both its meaning and measurement (Sabetelli, 1988). Since that time, research on marriage has become one of the most popular topics of inquiry in the social sciences; as a search in library databases such as Psych Info and Sociological Abstracts revealed more than 40,000 entries on marriage.

In exploring the marital research in the Unites States, an important issue emerges that will serve as the basis for the current research. Specifically, the issue addresses the validity of the tools used to perform cultural comparisons of marriage. Countless marriage instruments exist to measure marital quality; however, it is likely that these scales are ethnocentrically biased, since all have been developed in the west. Because of the potential bias of such scales, researchers must question the use of these tools for east-west comparisons. This is particularly true given the increasing evidence that constructs that are closely associated with marriage, such as love and intimacy, vary with culture (Dion & Dion, 1996; Seki, Matsumoto & Imahori, 2002). To be culturally accurate,

researchers should conduct studies with scales that reflect the value system of the societies of interest. It is hoped that the method used in this study, aimed at deriving a scale sensitive to cultural diversity in marriage, will be used as a template for future research on cultural differences in marital values.

The idea that there is cultural variability in conceptions of marriage is not a novel concept. For decades, scholars such as Goode (1959) have argued that romantic love in marriage is not a universal value; however it is only in the last decade or so that studies focused on culture and marriage have become more commonplace. Such research on cultural values in marriage has essentially focused on general comparisons in values between what has become known as the individualistic (i.e., 'Western') versus collectivistic (i.e., 'Eastern') societies. While useful, these analyses have often been limited to a particular part of the eastern world, namely Japan, China, and India in comparison to the U.S. and are in need of further expansion. Thus, an aim of the proposed study is to extend the focus of past research on Eastern cultures to include a comparison of an Arabic nation and a Western nation. No empirical studies exist that compare Arabic marital values with that of a Western group. More specifically, my study will compare the marital beliefs of the Lebanese, as an example of Arabs (or Easterners) with the marital beliefs of Americans, as an example of Westerners.

Literature Review

The field of marriage research, although a relatively new topic of investigation, is now considered a prominent domain of study in the social sciences. While today's researchers have come to accept marriage as a complex phenomenon that affects and is affected by a host of different factors, the pioneers of marital research focused primarily on one question: What differentiates happy and unhappy married couples (Terman, Butterweiser, Ferguson, Johnson & Wilson, 1938)? For those early researchers, self report measures were assumed to be the only way in which marriages could be analyzed. Furthermore, in their review of marital research in the 20th century, Gottman and Notarius (2002), indicate that self-report questionnaires remained the preferred analytic tool for the first 30 years of marital research.

An important shift in marital research occurred in the 1950's when it was suggested that the study of marital interaction patterns should replace, or at least supplement, personality and attitudinal characteristics as the key components in understanding marriage (Bateson, Jackson & Haley, 1956). It was hypothesized that certain individuals engage in dysfunctional patterns of interaction with their spouse and that these behavior patterns eventually impact the thinking processes and, in turn, marital attitudes. Trying to differentiate between functional and dysfunctional patterns of behavior led to methodological changes in the field of marital research. Of note was the development of an observational methodology whereby researchers watched a husband and wife interacting in the context of a particular situation and deduced how well the two generally interacted with one another. This novel approach of studying behavior in

context ran counter to the self report approach that measured "traits independent of situational contexts" (p.164, Gottman and Notarius, 2002).

Marital research continued along the 'interaction' path until the 1980's when theory-based research increased and the term marital quality became the new leading construct of interest in marriage studies (Spanier & Lewis, 1980). In line with the emphasis on theory, new topics of study emerged that were aimed at investigating the role of key constructs (e.g., parenthood, social class, feminism) believed to play a central role in affecting marital quality. Yet with the increasing complexity in the conceptualization of marriage came increasing debate as to what constituted progress in marital research (Spanier, 1985; Trost, 1985; Sabatelli, 1988; Crane, Allgood, Larson & Griffin, 1990). Far from agreeing that the various shifts in research direction over time constituted progress, scholars argued over what constitutes a key marital variable of interest (e.g., interaction, quality, satisfaction, adjustment, communication) and how to effectively measure constructs of importance.

Marital Measurement: Description and Flaws

Amongst the numerous marriage scales that have been developed in the United States, only a few have attracted considerable and continuous attention. Despite their age, the most popular tests are the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT, Locke and Wallace, 1959) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS, Spanier, 1976). In the last two decades, however, there has been considerable emphasis on scales that measure global evaluations of marriage such as the Quality of Marriage Index (QMI, Norton, 1983).

The MAT (Appendix A) was developed at a time when dysfunctional interactions were believed to cause marital conflicts. As a result, the scale was aimed at measuring

spouses' ability to resolve or avoid conflicts (Locke, 1951). The 15-item measure assesses spouses' degree of agreement on issues of importance to marriage and their ability to resolve conflict in an effective manner. Some of the items on the scale ask one to estimate the level of agreement or disagreement on issues such as handling finances, matters of recreation, friends and sexual relations (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The MAT was first analyzed with 236 participants (118 men, 118 women) all of whom were husband and wives not married to each other. They were US-born, European Americans, had an average of 14.5 years of education and were mostly professionals and salespeople (Fredman & Sherman, 1987). The validity test for this 'adjustment' scale was a comparison between 46 participants who were in marital therapy or were divorced or separated, and 48 persons who were judged by close friends as being "exceptionally well adjusted in marriage" (p.47, Fredman & Sherman, 1987). When their responses were analyzed, only 17 % of the divorced or separated group scored higher than 100 on the MAT scale as opposed to 96 % for the well adjusted group.

There have been a number of criticisms of this scale. First, it correlates with a social desirability scale (.63) and so the tendency to inflate the quality of the marriage is high. Second, the concept of adjustment varies with historical time as societal values change, and so what might have been true when the scale was first developed in the 1950's is unlikely to be applicable in marriages decades later (Sabatelli, 1988). For example, the highest 'adjustment' score is given to spouses who engage in "all outside activities together" and it would be questionable that such an item "deserve[s] a prominence in our judgment of a marriage's adjustment from a contemporary perspective" (p.896, Sabatelli, 1988).

The DAS (Appendix B) is a 32-item scale that also measures important elements in a marriage and addresses how well couples are able to resolve conflict. It was developed from an original 300 items that were selected from already existing scales of marital adjustment or related concepts. After duplicates were eliminated, three judges examined the rest of the items and decided which ones were indicative of marital adjustment in the 1970's. After reliability tests were performed, 32 items were considered relevant for their ability to significantly discriminate between married and divorced couples (Fredman & Sherman, 1987). The DAS contains four subscales: dyadic consensus, dyadic satisfaction, affectional expression and dyadic cohesion all of which were shown to be highly reliable (alpha coefficients between .73 to .94).However, the DAS is highly correlated with the MAT (r =.88) raising some theoretical concerns. Because with such high correlation between the two scales, one can argue that the DAS is in effect tapping into the same construct as the MAT. In fact, more than *2/3* of the items on the MAT are also on the DAS. Fincham and Bradbury (1987) contend that the high proportion of overlapping items in the MAT and DAS is mostly due to a lack of conceptual clarity on what is being measured. They refer to Huston and Robbins (1982) in pointing out that items on these measures confound questions about behavior in marriage with global evaluations of marriage. For example, items on the MAT that assess behavior include: "In leisure time do you generally prefer to be 'on the go'; to stay at home?" versus a more evaluative statement "Check the dot on the scale below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage" (Locke & Wallace, 1959). Behavioral items on the DAS ask: "How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?" versus attitudinal items such as "In general, how

often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?" (Spanier, 1976). In an effort to resolve the problem of using two conceptually different types of statements (evaluative and behavioral) within a single measurement scale, the Quality of Marriage index (QMI, Norton, 1983) was developed.

The QMI is a measure of marital quality developed by Norton (1983). The six-item scale (Appendix C) was developed as a way for a spouse to subjectively assess the relationship as a whole and in an *evaluative* manner (e.g., "we have a good marriage") as opposed to other measures of marital quality that assess behavior (e.g., "we have frequent sexual relations"). Norton contends that if one evaluates a marriage as 'good' because, for example, it is satisfying, it implies one is endorsing an inherent value of marriage. Norton contrasts the satisfaction example with the statement "we have frequent sexual relations," a statement that is both non-preferential and non-evaluative, and as such is both limited information and it is not evident how the frequency of sex covaries with the quality of marriage.

The items of Norton's MQI were derived from the Partner Communication Scale (Norton & Montgomery, 1982). Norton narrowed the scale from an original 261 items to 20 items that only asked general or global evaluative questions about marriage. A factor analysis yielded the final six items, with all items loading greater than .60 and a median effect of .76.

There has been some criticism that Norton's scale is limited in scope (Sabatelli, 1988). While this is true, it is also accurate to say it also has the advantage of being more focused in scope. Because it specifically measures overall marital quality, it avoids

confounding tricky concepts such as adjustment, interaction and satisfaction (Norton, 1983).

In considering these three scales, it is important to assess the deeper level marital values that underlie the development of these measures. While we have identified conceptual problems with the use of such instruments to measure the quality of a marriage, they are all reflective of beliefs about marriage that had some value at some particular time point in the American culture from which they were developed. For example, items found on the DAS include statements on friendship, sex, in-laws, and soul mates, all of which are believed to play some role in marriage in the U.S.

Marital Attitudes

Of greater relevance to the current study, are scales that were developed to measure marital values as opposed to measures of related domains such as satisfaction, adjustment, and quality. The availability of instruments that assess marital beliefs and values is almost non-existent. One such scale is the Marital Attitude Scale (MAS, Appendix D). The MAS, developed by Braaten and Rosen (1998), is a 23-item scale with high internal reliability (coefficient alpha =. 82). It asks participants to give their opinions regarding statements on marriage and includes items such as "marriage restricts individuals from achieving their goals"; "people weren't meant to stay in one relationship for their entire lives;" "marriage is a sacred act;" "because half of all marriages end in divorce, marriage seems futile;" and "marriage provides companionship that is missing from other types of relationships." Other marital value scales do exist but Braaten and Rosen point out that such instruments have been either unpublished (Hill, 1951), have

moderate internal consistency (Gabardi & Rosen, 1991), or are worded to apply to non-married people (Kinnaird & Gerrard, 1986). It should be mentioned that with regards to their own scale, Braaten and Rosen do not disclose the method used for developing it, only stating that they were "written to sample the various ways that persons can regard the institution of marriage" (p. 86).

Marital Scales and Culture

Remarkably absent in the research literature on marriage are scales that address how marital adjustment, quality or satisfaction may differ across cultures. This is a legitimate concern because most researchers have now accepted the idea that there exist cultural differences in love and marriage, particularly when it comes to comparing eastern and western value systems (Dion & Dion, 1996). A number of cross-cultural studies have investigated the concept of love, presumably related to marriage, and found interesting east-west differences. It should be noted, however, that all measurement scales used in these studies were developed by Americans and, as such, are likely to be biased in origin. For example, Simmons, von Kolke and Shimizu (1986) used both the Scale of Romanticism (Hobart, 1958), a measure of agreement or disagreement with 12 romantic statements, and the Attitude Towards Love Scale (Knox and Sporakowski, 1968) which consists of 29 statements that are descriptive of the nature of love. In their study that examined love attitudes, they used a cross-cultural sample and found that Germans were significantly more romantic than Japanese.

Another study conducted by Sprecher, Aron and Hatfield (1994) used the Romantic Beliefs Scale (Sprecher and Metts, 1989), a measure of the extent to which obstacles can be overcome in the presence of love. Using a cross-cultural sample of young men and women, they measured the love attitudes of American, Japanese and Russian nationals. Results showed the three cultures shared similar attitudes on love, irrespective of gender.

Finally, Ting-Toomey (1991) used the Relational Intimacy Scale (Braiker & Kelley, 1979), a measure of "the degree of love commitment, disclosure maintenance, ambivalence, and conflict in an intimate relationship" (p.37, Ting-Toomey, 1991), to assess intimacy expression in a sample of American, Japanese and French men and women. The author found that Americans were significantly more committed to love than their Japanese counterparts.

Despite the fact that the studies described above used translations and back translations to ensure that meaning was not lost, using such methodology overlooks a greater conceptual problem: namely that romantic love might hold different meaning across cultures. For example, it is possible that Japanese are no less romantic than Westerners but their understanding of romance differs from that of Americans. Using a scale that was developed in the Unites States and normed on a predominantly white, middle class American sample is likely to reflect the values of this group, irrespective of whether or not it was translated into Japanese.

Cultural psychologists, researchers who emphasize the importance of the role of culture in the psyche of human beings, have voiced the most concern about these validity issues with some even arguing that the role of culture in psychological research has been superficial (Cole, 1996). Shweder (1990) contends that cross-cultural strategies have introduced "noise" in translations instead of clarity as they fail to account for how "cultural traditions and social practices regulate, express, transform, and permute the human psych" (p. 1).

An example from developmental psychology might be useful to illustrate this 'translation' problem. A core value of middle-class European Americans is independence, a value expressed in their parental goal often expressed by having their baby or young child sleep alone. Shweder et al. (1998) suggests that this value can be expressed in the following form: "I value autonomy and independence; I want my children to become autonomous and independent adults; I know that I can promote autonomy and independence in infants and young children by having them sleep alone…" (p.873). This belief system however, is not valued in numerous countries in Asia, Africa and Central America. Shweder and colleagues contend that in places where autonomy and independence is not a core value, children prefer to and are encouraged to sleep with their parents even when other space is available. Failing to notice cultural differences in what is considered developmentally appropriate for a child will often result in members of one culture considering the other-culture's behavior as odd or abnormal. This lesson can be applied to values about marriage as well. For example, arranged

marriages are accepted and expected in many parts of the world but are considered an odd practice for many Westerners.

Despite the limitations inherent in using western marriage scales across cultures, scales that reflect Eastern values of marriage are practically non-existent. The only attempts to develop 'eastern' marriage scales were designed for studies on Indian (Upadhyay & Shukla, 1995) and Chinese populations (Xia, 2002). And as far as this author is aware, there exist no studies that address the need to create a measure of marriage that would reflect the values of Arabs. This is an important lacuna in research and a gap that is necessary to fill since there seems clear evidence that Arabs in general, and Lebanese in particular (as we shall discuss at a later part of this work), view marriage quite differently from Americans.

Cross-Cultural Study on Intimacy

As noted earlier, cross-cultural research on differences in beliefs about love and marriage is scarce. In an important exception Seki, Matsumoto and Imahori (2002) investigated cultural differences between Americans and Japanese in the concept of intimacy. The importance of their work lies in the methodology used. Instead of assuming from the outset that intimacy is similar across cultures, they developed intimacy related items after they conducted a pilot study that asked both Americans and Japanese to list items they believed were relevant to intimacy. Seki and colleagues then incorporated all items from the pilot study into an open-ended questionnaire that asked participants to remember conversations they had with relatives as well as same-sex and

opposite-sex friends about the meaning, conceptualization and expressions of intimacy. Participants were then asked to explain what the term meant to them in the context of these relationships. It is important to note that when it was translated into Japanese, the term *intimacy* (italics not mine) assumed a meaning that was not necessarily congruent with a dictionary translation but was "relevant in their real lives" (p.306). Particularly relevant to the current study was an intimacy question that asked participants to describe the characteristics of a lover. The authors found that what constitutes the ideal partner is indeed culturally specific, with Americans emphasizing physical contact and Japanese emphasizing the psychological aspects of love.

Individualism and Collectivism

Seki and colleagues' work is exceptional in that it is one of the few studies that investigated differences in a marriage related value – intimacy – and compared an eastern country (i.e., Japan) with a western one (i.e., United States). More generally, however, cultural differences between 'east' and 'west' have been extensively discussed in the broader rubric of individualism versus collectivism.

In general, collectivistic societies have been found to value group identity (Hui &, Triandis, 1986) with interdependence being encouraged and self-identity discouraged (Sinha, 1984; Segal, 1991). Extended families play an important role in forming the attitudes and beliefs of the people living in such a societal system (Mullatti, 1995). Self-initiative is usually discouraged because it might interfere with family closeness (Desai, 1999). On the other hand, families in an individualistic society are believed to be

subordinate to the individual, and their main role is to maximize the individual's well being (Sodowsky, Kwan & Pannu, 1995). In what ways are these two different value systems related to beliefs about love and marriage? Kim (1993) proposes the connection is clear if one views the value system of an individual operating at two levels: societal and personal. For example, at the societal level, a person living in a society that values individualism will value rights over duties. This means, for example, that if a person wishes to marry someone of a different religious affiliation one's right to make that choice supersedes any obligation to one's particular religious group. At the personal level, such a value system would entitle a person to say that, since it is my right to be autonomous, then any decision to choose a marital partner is entirely mine. On the other hand, collectivism at a societal level would emphasize the opposite – the superiority of duties over rights – because one's loyalty to a particular religion (to use the same example described above) is more important than one's desire to marry outside one's religion. In other words, individuals forming personal bonds within such a system must be attuned to the demands and needs of significant others. Thus, having control over marital partner choices would not be valued as highly in collectivistic societies as in individualistic cultures and consequently "falling in love" would not be sufficient a reason to wed.

Hofstede (1984) conducted one of the first studies that compared national differences based on individualism and collectivism. In work that sheds important light on east-west differences in value systems, Hofstede's extensive study examined more

than 40 countries and measured how national values affect work quality. Although not directly related to marital values or love attitudes, any study on quality of work is likely to spill over to marriage and as such is also relevant to the current study. Measuring each country's value system with a matched sample of employees of the same business corporation, Hofstede identified four dimensions of value systems: power distance (accepted inequality between members of a society); individualism; masculinity (no overlap in gender roles); and uncertainty avoidance (aggressive and emotional societies). Plotting scores by nations, Hofstede found that countries that scored high on the individualism scale viewed quality of life in terms of individual success, achievement and self actualization, and countries that scored low on the individualism scale viewed quality of life as determined by one's group, indicating they viewed quality of life in terms of one's fulfilling obligations to meaningful others such as family. Countries high on the individualism scale included the US, Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands and countries low on the scale included Japan, India, Korea, Thailand, a dozen south and central American countries and seven Arab countries. Hofstede's work is one of the rare studies to compare differences in individualism and collectivism between an Arab and a Western country.

Buda, Elsayed-Elkhouly and Sayed (1998) conducted a study to further lend support to Hofstede's finding that Americans and Arabs fall on different sides of the individualism-collectivism continuum. To test their hypothesis, they used a scale developed by Wagner (1995) which includes items such as: "Only those who depend

upon themselves get ahead in life;" "To be a superior person you must stand alone;" "People should be made aware that if they are going to be part of a group then they are sometimes going to have to do things they don't want to do" and "People in a group should realize that they are not always going to get what they personally want." Results indicated that Americans are significantly less collectivistic than participants from four Arab countries (United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait).

Westerman (1996) used open-ended interviews to compare Saudi Arabians (i.e., collectivistic) and Americans (i.e., individualistic) children's perception of self. She found differences along national lines and in the expected direction with Saudi children providing a social explanation of self and Americans providing a psychological description of self. Westerman concludes that the Arabic self is public and social while the American self is private.

When it comes to attitudes on love and marriage there is no published empirical work that has systematically compared the marital value system of men and women in the United States with their Arabic counterparts. It should be noted that Arab cultures do share some features of an 'eastern' or collectivist-type country but, as I will later discuss, there are some subtle distinctions between collectivistic and Arab societies in general that warrant distinguishing them as a separate group of interest.

History of Western Marriages

Literature on the history of marriage reveals that its meaning not only varies by culture but over time as well. In ancient Greece for example, the primary purpose of

marital unions in that part of the world was for procreation. Passionate love did exist but was only experienced between mature men and young boys (Gonzalez-Reigosa & Kaminsky, 1989). While it is true that Greek tragedies focused on heterosexual romance, these romances were viewed as enslaving passions doomed for failure and as such were considered unsuitable for marriage (Martinson, 1960).

In the middle ages, marriage in Anglo-Saxon societies was regulated by private laws and customs (Goodsell, 1935). The system was patriarchal, giving little freedom to young daughters to marry as they please. It should be noted, however, that religious leaders forbade marriages to occur against the will of the person tying the knot. Yet, fathers continued to have a firm grip on deciding who their children would marry.

During the renaissance, little changed and parents continued to play a predominant role in arranging marriages. According to Goodsell (1935), marriage was still a convenient way to advance the social and financial status of the families involved. Some writers even argued that it was "universally agreed that no idea could be more absurd, more detestable more immoral even [than romance]" (p.22, Maulde-La-Claviere, 1901). Because marriages were viewed as a 'business partnership' any "idea of pleasure was to rob it of its noble and honorable character, and to drag it down into the mire of sensuality [and] to mingle it with a physical suggestion was to degrade it" (p.22).

Marriages in the United States

In colonial America, marriage continued to be highly regulated and still required parental consent. Although young couples could initiate the desire to unite they could not

commit to a marital union without approval of the community of interest (Farrell, 1999). If those aspiring to marry did not acquire such consents then the court, parents, and neighbors did not hesitate to intervene and reprimand young couples (Wall, 1990).

According to Farrell, the nature and meaning of marriage in America changed around the mid-eighteenth century. The transformation marked a shift from marriage as an instrumental institution "to one based primarily on love, intimacy, and emotional attachment" (p.99, Farrell, 1999). Farrell contends that the structural change in society from a household to a market economy is a key cause for the shift in the meaning of marriage. As new institutions began to emerge and offer services such as welfare agencies, schools, asylums and hospitals, they replaced the wife as the primary provider of such services. As a result, spouses searched for new ways to connect through emotional closeness and companionship.

The development of romance and intimacy as the new centerpiece of marriage was also ideologically based. Following the end of British rule, Americans felt liberated from "international tyranny" (p.99, Farrell, 1999) and could no longer tolerate being told how to live domestically. A significant consequence of this new-found freedom was the development of an independent self with rights and privileges including the right to marry whomever one wishes. Farrell contends that this change in the value of marriage became more pronounced following the industrial revolution because the romantic model "fit the new emphasis on individualism... the ideological compliment of industrial capitalism" (p.100).

The tradition of romantic marriages in western societies, which started about two hundred years ago, has continued to grow and appears to be all pervasive in American culture today. Whether it is through movies, songs, magazines, television programs, novels or self-help-books, marriage is invariably depicted as a romantic endeavor. Some scholars have described this perspective as overly idealistic (Simic & Custred, 1982; Jones, 1991; Coontz, 2004; Gillis, 2004) and some have even called it a 'nostalgia trap' that favors men over women (Coontz, 1992). However, there seems to be no indication that the current meaning of marriage in western societies, let alone America, is about to change. National surveys in this country repeatedly show that a top pre-condition for marriage is falling in love (Glenn, 1996; Tucker, 2000; Knox, Mc Ginty, Zusman & Abowitz, 2003).

Goode (1959) provides another explanation as to why Americans value romantic love as a precondition to marriage. He says that marriage analysts have often suggested that because Americans have such different backgrounds, there is often only little commonality between a couple. As a result, romantic love acts as a powerful medium for people to connect long enough to marry and live together.

If there is little in common between individuals it is not surprising that Americans place individual achievement (e.g., through work) as an overarching goal. The emphasis on self also means believing that persons are independent agents capable of independent choice. It is as a result of being concerned with individualistic needs that there is *less* need for Americans to be attentive to other factors that might be of value in a marriage.

For example, Prothro and Diab (1974) argue that the pre-industrialized necessity to value the views of the nuclear and extended family, which were the main source of economic support, become obsolete when societies become technologically advanced. They argue that in a technically advanced setting, "urbanization and industrialization offer opportunity for individualism and alternative supports to the individual" (p.5) and consequently support from the extended family is less necessary. Prothro and Diab also point out that romanticism is an ideology that can only operate within a technically advanced society because only such societies can afford to think ideally. Gillis (2004) makes a similar point saying that Americans have opted to choose "marriages of the mind" because they view such unions in a highly idealized and symbolic fashion. Gillis explain that this is the root cause for the nuclearization of marriage, the idea that the most valuable and meaningful social unit is the smallest. In other words, the most powerful social connections are amongst two human beings and an effective way to form this bond is to develop a romantic liaison that can be contracted to last through marriage. This system of thought is a shift from that of past centuries when a large social unit was deemed more valuable than a small social unit. (Gillis, 2004).

Cultural Differences in the Meaning of Marriage Within the United States: Latino and African-American Families

In talking about American family nuclearization it is important to note that there are cultural exceptions to this ideology in the U.S. More specifically, there is enough evidence to suggest that the two other populous ethnic groups in the U.S. - African

Americans and Latino Americans - exhibit marriage values atypical of the westernized version of self and as such should not be included in the European American and westernized version of self.

Farhadian (1999) argues that the individualization of self as a product of the American (western) society only reflects values of the dominant and privileged middle-class, white society. As they acquire more money and status, the privileged Americans become further disassociated from minority groups such as the African-American and the Latino population. Coontz (1992) argues that economic hardship, by its nature, bonds people together. She says that the 1930 economic crash in the U.S. was hardest on African-Americans who, as a result, learned to live and share with kin and neighbors. Sudarkasa (1997) points out that the central role of family among the African American population has been recognized by almost all historians and that extended families have always played a role in their lives. Sudarkasa also argues that values of collectivism and extended family are more common among the poorest because it is the most financially sound option. But once the poor (typically the Black population) acquire more wealth, they begin to develop a more isolated sense of self too and thus begin to resemble the dominant (White) culture (Sudarkasa, 1997).

Empirical evidence to support the claims of the likes of Sudarkasa and Farhadian is minimal. One notable exception is an extensive study by Broman (2005) who used three waves of data from 1400 participants. Using face to face interviews, he found that

African Americans were less likely than Whites to say they feel loved by their wives. However, at the same time, Blacks characterized their wives less negatively than Whites.

There is also scant empirical evidence about differences between European and Latino Americans in their beliefs about marriage. Decades of theoretical work, however, indicates that family plays a central role in Hispanic culture (Contreras, Hendrick & Hendrick, 1996). Latinos are well-known for their endorsement of the value of 'familism,' the notion that one's close and extended family is placed ahead of the individual's interest and personal growth (Ingoldsby, 1991).

Research on the differential role of family in Latino and European American populations, however, is scarce and provides mixed results. Keefe, Padilla & Carlos (1979) conducted a three phase study comparing Mexican-Americans with Anglo-Americans in the role of extended family as an emotional support system. Using bi-weekly interviews over nine months, they found no differences in the role of extended family as a support group.

A similar study was conducted by Keefe (1984) who investigated differences between Mexican Americans and European Americans in their perception of the role of family. Surveying over 300 participants in each group in a two-stage study, she found that it is not so much that family is important to one group and not to another but that the meaning of family closeness varies between them. Specifically, Keefe found that while Mexican Americans require the constant presence of kin around them, European Americans are content with intermittent visits and phone calls.

Also, Oropesa (1996) showed that there are ethnic differences in normative beliefs about marriage. Using a sample derived from the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) he compared Puerto Rican and Mexican Americans to White Americans' desire to marry. Oropesa's main finding was that Latino Whites were more pronuptial than non-Latino whites and were less accepting of cohabitation.

The evidence above highlights that Americans, although often characterized as simply 'Westerners', are quite heterogeneous in their marriage beliefs. This is not really surprising if one simply considers two factors: the geographic size of the country (the U.S. is larger than continental Europe) and the diversity and quantity of its immigrating population. Known as the melting pot of the world, it would be an oversimplification to assume that because America is composed of 'united states', cultural groups that live within those different states are united in their beliefs about marriage.

Arab Marriages and the Special Case of Lebanon.

The ethnic group that has come to be known as Arabs refers to a population of people who speak Arabic and descend from the nomadic tribes from the region of Arabia (Abudabbeh, 1996). Today, the Arab world comprises 21 states and stretches over 5.25 million square miles of land between the Persian Gulf and the Atlantic (Barakat, 1985). Arabs were under foreign rule for most of their history with many countries gaining independence only about half a century ago. The pervasive foreign influence is probably a reason for the great heterogeneity within Arabic culture. However, Arabs remain united

by a common language which many consider as their most treasured cultural heritage (Henry, Amara and Al-Tawqi, 1993).

Arabs are also known for their extreme loyalty to extended family and kin and have an abiding suspicion of state authority. According to Hamady (1960) this suspicion can be traced back to pre-Islamic times and the social structure of tribes. These early groups were headed by a *Sayyid* (Shayk) whose primary function was to arbitrate as opposed to lead. Hamady says that as a result of this structure, tribesmen were loyal to their equals whom they sacredly protected, as opposed to the ruler, who was used only when needed. Anthropologists in Egypt and Lebanon have documented this fact, showing that both rural and city dwellers show allegiance to their group over and above the state, whose laws they often chose to disobey (Ammar, 1966; Joseph, 2004).

In addition to language and kinship structure, Arabs were united by their desire to be freed from western domination. When independence was achieved by most countries, the fervor of Arab nationalism was at its highest and viewed entirely in terms of an opposition to western imperialism (Ibrahim, 1996). But the political agenda that united Arabs to a common cause was short-lived and a series of events in the second half of the 20th century made it clear that Arabs did not have a common political movement (Tibi, 1981). In fact, Henry et al. (2003) argue that what unites this group of people today seems to be more a function of regional solidarity (e.g., North Africa, Western Asia) rather than common ideology.

Despite having many common features, Arabs are also quite heterogeneous as a people. Scholars have become increasingly aware of this fact and have voiced the need to conduct comparative research at the national level (Joseph, 1999a). For example, there are notable differences between Egypt and Tunisia on the one hand and Lebanon on the other. Specifically, Egypt and Tunisia for example are large yet homogenous countries while Lebanon is a tiny, heterogeneous and fragmented country (Barakat, 1985). Furthermore, this author believes there are three more facts about Lebanon that warrants its status as a special case among Arab countries, making it a particularly interesting comparison group to Americans. First, there are equal numbers of Christians and Muslims in its population making it the only such country whose Christian population is not a small minority. Second, there are 18 recognized sects rendering its social structure quite complex. Third, and probably as a result of this religious mosaic, Lebanon has incurred two civil wars in its short history scarring its population and reshaping how its citizens view themselves. It is because of such differences between Lebanon and other Arab countries that I have chosen to focus on the former as a comparison group with Americans.

Lebanese Identity

Joseph (1993b) has done some extensive field work to develop an understanding of Lebanese identity. After living among families in various parts of Lebanon for many years, she concludes that the Lebanese perceive of family as an integral part of personhood, a kind of natural extension of themselves. She concludes that the concept of

connectivity and relationality is part of the very fabric of its society and in fact defines the essence of relationships among relatives of blood (Joseph, 2000).

For Joseph (1999a), the understanding of connectivity has a profound meaning in Lebanese culture. She holds that this term is employed to describe "relationships in which a person's boundaries are relatively fluid so that persons feel a part of significant others" (p.11) and "...each needs the other to complete the sense of selfhood (p.11, Joseph, 1999b)." This understanding of self has important ramifications for how marriage is viewed. Because they are intensely connected to one another, Lebanese highly value their family's viewpoints on matters of importance such as choice of marital partners and the state of their marriage. This signifies, for example, that feelings about the marriage - such as the sense of being happy with one's spouse - cannot be disassociated from how family perceives the partner. In other words, it is unlikely that a Lebanese person can evaluate the state of their marriage as being a happy one independently of how their family views it.

Reflecting the degree of family cohesion in Lebanese families, parents are often merged linguistically with their children (Joseph, 1993a). For example, mothers call their children 'mama' (mummy) and fathers call their children 'baba' (daddy). Joseph says this phenomenon was commonly observed when she conducted her 10-year field study in Lebanon. These observations lead her to conclude that by "collapsing terms of address" (p.472) seniors and juniors become a single entity. Bodies are also linguistically merged.

Relatives commonly express love for one another in language by saying 'inta qalbi; inta ouyouni' (you are my heart; you are my eyes).

In a society that places high value on family, values such as honor and shame are of great importance (Simon, 1996). A shamed person "blackens the whole family name (p.371)" and is therefore one of the most dreaded outcomes in a marriage. This contrasts with European-American values where autonomy and self-reflection are essential to the marriage value system. As a result, one of the primary developmental goals of Americans is to mature into individuals capable of making independent decisions. This is of course not to ignore that family in America has always played an influential role in directing and sometimes even controlling young adults' marriage decisions. But this kind of parental influence diminished in America in the second quarter of the 20th century as the institution of courtship and dating began to take over (Farrell, 1999). Farrell contends that "as the world of public leisure replaced the private home as the site of courtship, parental power lessened... (p.105)."

The distinction between various types of cultural identities has also been discussed more generally by Roland (1988). He contends that Americans fall in the category of what he refers to as the individualized or the "self-reflective" self, a type of identity that is a product of a mobile society where self is autonomous. In such a societal system, identity is structured around the achievement of one's "inner potentials in various activities and relationships" (p.9, Roland, 1988). Roland argues that because such individuals value autonomy and self-reflection, they engage in activities that are beyond

the realm of their families since kin are often perceived as being both intrusive and interfering in the process of self-exploration.

In contrast to the self-reflective self, the familial identity is described as a "basic inner psychological organization that enables women and men to function well within the hierarchical intimacy relationships of the extended family, community, and other groups" (p.7, Roland). Such identity is centered around the inter-dependence and emotional connection between family members with which "there is a constant affective exchange through permeable outer ego boundaries...where high levels of empathy and receptivity to others are cultivated, and where the experiential sense of self is of a 'we-self' (i.e., familial identity) that is felt to be highly relational in different social contexts" (pp.7-8). Roland does not specifically discuss Arabs as one people who are predominantly of the familial kind but does say that this kind of identity is characteristic of Mediterranean countries and Lebanon is one such Arab state.

Breaking the self/society and individualist/collectivist dichotomies

In arguing that Lebanese value a familial identity (collectivistic) and European-Americans value a self-reflective identity (individualistic), it is important not to assume that this implies that Americans are *selfish* in their marriage values and Lebanese are *self-less*. This is a point worth making, because most studies have tended to dichotomize societies as either individualistic or collectivistic without giving fair attention to how individuals can hold *both* values. Joseph (1993a) argues that the Lebanese can be highly individualistic when it comes to supporting and helping their society. They have

disrespect for laws and often will collude with their extended families to break laws if they find it suitable. Thus, the Lebanese are collectivist "we-self" oriented persons only with regard to loyalty to family. Such an attachment to family values at the expense of societal values is particularly obvious in Lebanese society (as opposed to Arabs in general) because civil wars have made this country's citizens distrustful of its leaders and government. Some have even argued that because they so profoundly neglect their societal structures and have a highly entrepreneurial spirit, the Lebanese are in fact an individualistic people (Hakim, 1966; Johnson, 1977).

In the case of the European-American interpretation of self, it would be incorrect to assume that because such a society tends to adopt the rational and self-reflective aspect of self, then an action is taken without consideration of others. Americans help others in great numbers, locally and internationally, as they abundantly donated to relief efforts following the South Asia Tsunami and Louisiana/Mississippi hurricane disasters. In these examples, Americans reached out indiscriminate of religion, nationality, or ethnic background. On the other hand, the Lebanese have an inclination to help within their own families in times of hardship and need and, by extension, connect with welfare associations of similar religious denomination (Khalaf, 1971).

In terms of marriage, attachment to family is reflected in the fact that over a quarter of Lebanese marriages in Beirut are consanguineous (Klat & Khudr, 1986). Joseph (1993a) found similar results in her 10-year anthropological study in a Beirut suburb where she found that a first-cousin marriage is the ideal wedding scenario. Joseph

also found insignificant religious differences in this belief and concluded that marrying a relative is highly valued among Christians and Muslims alike.

Our discussion of Lebanon has so far been focused on summarizing the characteristics of the Lebanese population as a whole. An issue that needs to be given particular attention at this point in our analysis of marital values is the extent to which the Lebanese sample used in this study will be representative of the values of its home citizens. Since this work will be conducted in the United States, the main obstacle to generalization is acculturation. In this next section, I will describe the different models of acculturation and address the concerns outlined above.

Acculturation

Acculturation is defined as a process of change that results from two distinct cultures coming into contact with one another (Berry, 1997). Berry (1998) contends that acculturation occurs when any or all attitudes, values and behaviors are altered when contact is initiated with a member of a different culture. Some theorists have argued for a unidirectional model of change, meaning that the culture of origin is progressively replaced with a new culture (Spindler, 1955; Graves, 1967; Felix-Ortiz, Newcomb & Myers,1994). More popular however, is the view that acculturation is a complex bi-directional and multi-faceted phenomenon that involves the retaining of some traits as new ones are gained (Keefe, 1980; Niemann, Romero, Arredondo & Rodriguez, 1999; Monzo & Rueda, 2006). Those in favor of the later model contend that acculturation occurs more readily for observable elements of behaviors, behavioral intentions, as

opposed to more central beliefs, such as attitudes or values (Triandis, Kashima, Shimada & Villareal, 1986).

A number of studies have explored the distinction between behavioral and attitudinal acculturation in the Latino population. Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal and Marin (1987) investigated how the central construct of familialism affected a sample of Mexicans and participants from other Central American countries as they acculturated into the White US culture. Their findings suggest that attitudinal familialism (e.g., loyalty, solidarity) did not change as a function of time spent in the host country but behavioral familialism (e.g., visiting patterns) did. The authors speculate that support from family is a core value that is not easily changed. Another study on people of Mexican origin who moved to the US showed similar results. Keefe (1980) conducted a correlational analysis and found that familialism and the role of extended family was in fact strengthened as Mexican-Americans increased their contact with the host culture. The findings show that despite a decrease in ethnic loyalty as this group acculturated to the host society, their reliance on kin increased; confirming previous research that Mexican acculturation of White Americans values and beliefs is slow despite their long residence in the US (Grebler, Moore & Guzman, 1970). Keefe concludes that one explanation for this phenomenon is that strong family ties are often an obstacle to the acculturation process.

Research has also shown that some collectivistic values are maintained when immigrants from the 'east' move to an individualistic or western-type nation. Studying

Greek immigrants in Australia, Rosenthal, Bell, Demetriou and Efklides (1989) found that Greeks continued to value their country's cultural and religious traditions. The study also found some convergence between Greek and Anglo-Australians on behavior and behavioral intentions (as opposed to beliefs) thus confirming Sabogal et al. and Keefe's findings that behavioral acculturation occurs more readily than attitudinal acculturation.

Finally, there is some evidence that age of arrival to a host nation is a moderating factor for acculturation (Rosenthal, 1984; Matsuoka, 1990). A study that investigated the acculturation of Hispanic immigrants to the US found that acculturation does increase linearly as a function of time spent in the host country but is *slower* for older family members than for younger ones. Kuo and Roysircar (2004) found similar results when testing this hypothesis on a cohort of Chinese teenagers who immigrated to Canada at different ages. The authors found that individuals who arrived at a younger age to Canada were significantly more likely to become acculturated to Canadian values. Finally, Sodowsky and Plake (1992) looked at temporal cut off points for differences in acculturation. In a study using a sample of international participants who have been in the US for varying amounts of time, they found a significant difference in acculturation between those who spent 0 to 2 + years and 3 to 5 + years with those who lived in the US for 6 years of more. For their measure of acculturation, the authors used the American-International Relations Scale (AIRS) an instrument that was pretested on international staff, students and faculty at a south western university and showed high reliability (Sodowsky & Plake, 1991). Finally, a study that investigated the acculturation of

Chinese adolescents in the U.S. (Feldman, Mont-Reynaud and Rosenthal, 1992) used a sample of participants who had been living in the host country for at least three years but no rationale was given for using this cut-off point.

Although no studies have directly addressed the acculturation of the Lebanese in America and how this might affect their marital values, two relevant conclusions can be drawn from the acculturation research just reviewed. Firstly, it seems fairly clear that marital values fall in the category of attitudes and beliefs (as opposed to behaviors or behavioral intentions) and the evidence indicates this category is the one more likely to resist acculturation. Secondly, we have seen that it is specifically the support of family that Latinos appear to maintain as a value despite their lengthy stay in America. Since Lebanese hold similar high regard for kin, there is no reason to suspect that the Lebanese will be different in this regard and give up a core value such as their views on marriage in favor of that of the host country. This is particularly true if they have lived in the U.S. for two years or less, the empirical bench-mark for an acculturation cut-off point (Roysircar, 2006).

A problem might arise, however, if we use length of stay in a host country as the only variable that measures acculturation status. According to Roysircar, who has done extensive research on acculturation processes and measurement, time spent in the U.S. is a single item variable and its use – by itself - is sketchy (Roysircar, 2006). In a personal communication with Roysircar, she suggested the problem be addressed by not only making a comparison between three Lebanese groups (those who have lived here 5-plus years versus those who have lived here less than two years, with a crossover middle

group), but also using both an acculturation scale in addition to years of residence to partial out their respective contributions to marital values. By finding significant differences in acculturation between the newly-arrived emigrants and the older ones, it would seem reasonable to argue that the less acculturated group will, to some extent, hold more strongly to the marital values of their Lebanese heritage.

Gender role expectations and acculturation.

Another factor that seems to differentially affect the speed of acculturation to a new country is gender. Based on what is known about changes in gender expectations with changes in societal structure, there is reason to suggest that women will be quicker and more likely to adopt the lifestyle of the host country *if* it has more egalitarian principles than their country of origin. The most common argument is that women whose culture of origin is male dominated (e.g., collectivist societies such as China, Arab countries) will find it more attractive to espouse the beliefs of a society that gives them more choices (e.g., individualistic societies) including work, finance and marriage related decisions (Felmlee, 1994). With greater possibilities to join the education and labor force, money begins to shift hands in favor of women who consequently gain power to make decisions. This new-found independence can be very attractive to women who have been subordinated to men in that regard. But for men, on the other hand, acculturation to an individualistic-type nation seems less attractive. This is because the evidence suggests that as women gain more access to higher education and income, men contribute more to household labor (Blair & Lichter, 1991). This change in role expectation is usually considered a demeaning shift for men whose traditional role as head of household in a

collectivistic society - such as Lebanon - is to not participate in chores and household labor.

In studies of gender differences in acculturation, the evidence does seem to confirm women acculturate more quickly than men. In a study of Vietnamese adolescents who migrated to Australia, Rosenthal, Ranieri and Klimidis (1996) found that girls gave up traditional values of their home country faster than boys did. The authors conclude that "when these [Vietnamese] families are located in a culture that has an individualistic and relatively egalitarian tradition, it is the young girls who are likely, with exposure to Western values, to see the disadvantage of their role within a traditional eastern culture" (p.89). This finding was replicated by Tang and Dion (1999) whose study of gender differences in acculturation among Chinese university students in Canada showed that women endorsed traditionalism less than their male counterparts.

An interesting finding from an older study showed gender differences in only one dimension of acculturation. Specifically, Szapocznik, Arca, Scopetta, Kurtines and Aranalde (1978) found that Hispanic men who moved to the US acculturated faster than Hispanic women in terms of behavioral acculturation but no gender differences were found in terms of value acculturation.

Finally, a recent study by Kuo and Roysircar (2004) looked at gender as one of the variables that predicted differences in levels of acculturation. Using the Majority Minority Relations Survey (MMRS) to measure attitudinal acculturation, they concluded that gender was not an acculturation predictor for Chinese adolescents who moved to Canada. The authors offered no explanation for why men and women did not differ in how they acculturated to Canadian society.

Gender differences among European Americans

A vast literature has investigated the more general question of how American men and women differ in their perceptions of interpersonal relationships (Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982, 1986; Rancer & Dierks-Stewart, 1985; Jordan & Surrey, 1986; Miller, 1986; Markus & Oyserman, 1989; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1997). There seems to be general agreement among feminists and non-feminists alike that women tend to view relationships as an opportunity to connect with others (Lyons, 1983; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986; Gilligan, 1986). Thus, women are perceived as being more emotional and connected than men, a description that fits their societal role as "nurturer, caretaker, and helpmate" (p. 17, Gilligan, 1982). A number of studies have confirmed that women value interdependence and attachment in there close relationships as opposed to detachment (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Wheelan & Verdi, 1992; Hall, Irish, Roter, Ehrlich & Miller, 1994).

Men, on the other hand, tend to view relationships as an affirmation of self, an extension of the western ideal of autonomous and independent development (Markus & Oyserman, 1989; Markus, Mullally & Kitayama, 1997). Numerous studies have confirmed that men view themselves more autonomously than women do (Ickes, Robertson, Tooke & Teng, 1986; McGuire & McGuire, 1987; Thoits, 1992). Lyons (1983), for example, found that men described themselves in more separated terms than women. Also, Kato and Markus (1993) found that sentences that involve bonds with others are significantly more endorsed by women than by men.

In terms of marital values, it is reasonable to conclude that gender role expectations result in European-American men being more individualistic than European-

American women in their beliefs about marriage. More specifically, one can say that since men's self schema are primarily based on values of independence and autonomy, their beliefs about marriage will tend to be personally rather than socially-determined. Women, on the other hand, have a socially-oriented self-schema and as such are more "ensembled, communal or connected" (p. 101, Markus & Oyserman, 1989) than men. As a result, it is unlikely that European American women will value aspects of marriage that emphasize individualism as much as men would. Thus, and based on the discussion of differences between men and women in both a western and eastern culture, it seems that gender, in and of itself, may play a determining role in shaping values and beliefs about marriage.

Summary

The primary goals of the present study are twofold. The first aim is to examine how culture and gender shape values about marriage. A second goal is to propose a new technique to explore marital values that is sensitive to cultural differences.

Questions and Hypotheses

Question #1: Will values about marriage differ by culture? Specifically, will Americans and Lebanese hold different values regarding marriage?

Hypothesis # 1: European Americans and Lebanese Americans will differ regarding the values that are considered important in a marriage. Americans will give priority to aspects of marriage that conform to a nuclearization of the relationship (i.e., display of affection, sex, uniqueness , time and leisure activities performed together); Lebanese will give priority to aspects of marriage that conform to the familial aspect of the relationship (i.e., honor, conventionality, respect for parent views, compromise,

sacrifice). This difference in value system is hypothesized to be in degree of importance rather than mutual exclusion. Two analyses will be performed to test this hypothesis: A factor analysis by rows – better knows as a Q sort – that will determine if individuals with particular characteristics will significantly resemble one another; and an analysis of variance, to test general group differences. A difference is also expected within the Lebanese sample. Specifically, it is hypothesized that Lebanese-Americans who have lived in the U.S. for seven-plus years will endorse marital values that will resemble the American group more closely than Lebanese-Americans who have lived in the U.S. for five years or less. To test this hypothesis, an acculturation test will first be performed to determine whether or not the two Lebanese American groups have indeed acculturated differently. Second, an analysis of variance will be performed to test if the Lebanese who have lived in the U.S. for 7-plus years do resemble the Americans more than those who have lived in the U.S. less than 5 years.

Question # 2: Are there gender difference in marital values; specifically, do women endorse items that emphasize emotions, nurturance and social connectedness (i.e., collectivistic characteristics) and men endorse items that emphasize self-reflectiveness (i.e., individualistic characteristics)?

Hypothesis # 2: Adding to the vast body of evidence that indicate Western men and women view relationships differently – women value its emotional aspects and men value its instrumental/rational aspect - it is hypothesized that women will endorse statements about marriage that reflect its connective, communal, and communicative dimensions significantly more than men, regardless of culture. To test this hypothesis we will conduct both a Q sort factor analysis (to determine separate loadings by clusters of

individuals) and an ANOVA analysis (to determine overall group differences). A within culture gender difference is also expected among Lebanese-Americans regarding acculturation. Specifically, it is hypothesized that Lebanese women will acculturate more quickly than their male counterparts, regardless of whether they are new immigrants (i.e., less than 5 years in the U.S.) or older ones (i.e., 7-plus years in the U.S.), and consequently will endorse the dominant culture's view on marriage significantly more than men. This expected result is consistent with most research that has shown that moving from a collectivistic-type country to an individualistic-type country leads to a shift in perception of gender roles particularly if the values of the new culture are liberal and rights-oriented and the values of the culture of origin is markedly patriarchal. To test this hypothesize we will first conduct an acculturation test to determine whether or not Lebanese women do acculturate faster than men. Second, we will look at gender differences in Q sort factor loadings for the Lebanese sample. This analysis would serve the purpose of determining whether or not Lebanese men and women differ in their marital values and, if they do, are such value differences concordant with the acculturation literature that suggests women are more likely than men to endorse the host countries values. Third, we will conduct an analysis of variance to test general group differences between Lebanese men and women.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Forty-five male and forty-five female participants were recruited for this study. There were 30 participants in each of three categories (European Americans; Lebanese or Lebanese- Americans living in the US for 4 years or less; Lebanese or Lebanese-Americans living in the US for 7 years or more) with equal numbers of men and women in each group. Participants were at least 18 years of age and married, with the exception of one person whose wedding date was scheduled within a month of his participation.

The European-American group consisted of individuals who lived in or around neighboring towns of the main campus of the University of Massachusetts. With the exception of one participant who was married to a Thai woman and lived in south-east Asia for 8 years, all other Americans had married a compatriot and had been residing in the US since birth. The rationale for choosing White European Americans is because this ethnic group is believed to represent the prototype of the 'western' group. African-Americans and Latinos were excluded from this study because of some expected similarities with Lebanese on views about marriage.

The Lebanese groups consisted of individuals who lived in various parts of Massachusetts and Connecticut. All were first generation immigrants, foreign-born. The acculturated group consisted of participants who have been living in the U.S. for seven years or more and the unacculturated group consisted of participants who have been in the U.S. for four years or less. The above cut-off mark for years of residence in the US

was used based on the empirical evidence on acculturation processes that were reviewed in the previous chapter.

While an attempt was made to match participants in the US and Lebanese groups on age, income, education and years of marriage, there remained some differences between groups on a number of demographic characteristics which will be discussed in the next chapter. One difficulty in matching participants' demographic characteristics was due to challenges in finding Lebanese participants who had recently immigrated to the US. The declining number of newer Lebanese immigrants is explained by the implementation of stricter immigration laws following the events of September 11th, 2001 (Roysircar, personal communication, March 29th, 2007). Thus, the influx of new families – particularly those of Arab origins – has decreased considerably over the last few years. And because it has become harder for Lebanese nationals to immigrate to the US, many have resorted to illegal means to enter the country. Thus, it became additionally difficult to recruit participants because many illegal aliens feared revealing *any* information about themselves, despite a guarantee of anonymity.

Procedure

Data for this study was gathered in two different ways. The Lebanese sample was drawn from various social, professional and political groups (e.g. Network of Arab American Professionals, American-Lebanese engineering society, World Lebanese Cultural Union, Lebanese White Pages). Most of the recruitment was done through asking participants who were successfully contacted if they knew of any married Lebanese or Lebanese-American willing to partake in the study, thus creating a snow ball effect. The study took place at the home or workplace of participants, depending on

convenience. All Americans were interviewed at their homes or a Child Care center where some of the participants worked.

All participants were informed of the nature of the study and conditions of instructions were explained. In Stage I of this study, Lebanese and American participants completed a demographic questionnaire that included questions about age, gender, years of education, yearly income, ethnicity and religion. Lebanese participants also completed a second questionnaire which evaluated their level of acculturation to American society and values. In Stage II of this study, all participants were asked to rank a number of statements regarding marriage using a Q sort technique. A detailed description of this approach will follow. Specifically, participants were handed 56 statements about marriage on flash cards and asked to place them on a cardboard choosing one of 11 options that ranged on a continuum from "most significant to me" to "least significant to me". After completing the Q sort, subjects were thanked for their participation and then debriefed. The only inducement for their participation was a promise made by the recruiter that when the study is completed, they will be re-contacted and informed of the results.

Q Methodology

Introduced by William Stephenson (1935), Q methodology has been given little attention by psychologists. The basic principle of this method is to ask participants to rank-order in a systematic way a sample set of statements (i.e., stimuli) according to particular conditions of instruction (e.g., "what do you value the most and least in marriage?"). The intention of its inventor was to conduct a factor analysis of the responses in a matrix that is 'inversed' so that the variables are *persons* rather than tests

(Kitzinger, 1987). This was a bold shift in approach because it implied using the flip side of Pearson's R correlation. Thus, rather than asking 'how are different test results related' (e.g. how is depression related to intelligence) Stephenson asked "how do different persons relate in their characterizations of self?"

In Q methodology, the purpose is to avoid the assumed objectivity of traditional psychometric tests. When a person fills out questions on a depression inventory or a marriage scale, it is assumed that a certain characteristic is already of some value to the person, an assumption based on the power of test generalizability. But the intention of a Q sort is to move away from general propositions into the domain of specific and personal psychological attributes (Stephenson, 1953). If we are interested in the particular value system of each person in our test, Q can provide a sensible answer since it takes into consideration each participants' rating of a particular attribute. Stevenson gives an example of the trickiness of conventional psychometric tests by pointing to the fact that if two children score similarly on an IQ test we are left doubtful as to whether they have the same score for the same reasons. To use another example, if two people have similar scores on a depression scale, it is not an indication that both persons are similarly depressed or that they are depressed for the same reasons. Every person has their own 'story to tell' and that is what is missed in a conventional test. Thus in devising this method, Stephenson's concern was to grasp "the total person in action" (p.4, 1953). Brown (1980) agrees with Stephenson's approach, saying that when our interest is to measure value preferences, then Q methodology is "the most sensible and straightforward strategy" (p.53).

The objections raised about this method have been plentiful, most noteworthy are the attacks from behavioral psychologists such as Cattell (1944) and Burt (1937) who could not see the value in subjectivity and perceived it as a return to the introspective beginnings of psychology (Kitzinger, 1987). Part of their argument focused on the fact that Q was not a new statistical method but simply transposing a matrix so it is analyzed by rows instead of columns. In other words, R & Q are identical methods of analysis using the *same* matrix. But there are reasons to believe R & Q methodologies employ two *different* matrices and are thus fundamentally different. Brown (1980) says that we cannot simply assume that factoring a person's value preferences is the same as factoring information about 'facts' such as income, education level, ethnicity and extroversion. They are dissimilar, Brown contends, because the totality of Q statements reveal information about the belief system of a person while a population of psychometric tests reveals "pure facts, the sum of which is not the essence of human preference" (p.53).

One reason why I have chosen to use Q as a method of analysis is because of its quality as a powerful synthesizer of belief systems of persons in a comprehensive sense. Since a main objective of this work is to understand how culture shapes persons' overall values about marriage - and Q has been argued as the most effective method to tap into value preferences (Brown, 1980) - then using it is warranted. Another reason for choosing Q is because it has the convenient particularity of not having a set minimum for sample size or limits on the amount of items needed for sound statistical analysis. According to Mc Keown and Thomas (1988) the only limitation on the number of statements in a Q sort is the topic of inquiry and the imagination of the researcher. This is particularly useful to keep in mind when the study of interest is as complex an issue as

marriage because western (American) scales are limited in scope and eastern (Arabic) scales are non-existent.

The Q sort developed for this analysis consisted of items related to marital values that participants ranked along a continuum from least important to most important. A total of 56 statements were used for this study, representing 28 'values.' Thus, each 'value' had two statements, one that endorsed it and one that didn't. To use the example of 'honor', participants had to rate both "Family honor is an outdated value. I am only interested in honoring the vows of my marriage;" and "Honor means more than just 'defending' my spouse. It means defending the beliefs and values of both our extended families". A full list of items used for this study can be found in Appendix E.

After the statements representing marital values were selected, the Q sort was administered. The particular condition of instruction for this experiment was: "sort the items according to what you value most in marriage (+5) to what you value least in marriage (-5)." [1] Participants then proceeded to sort the statements deciding where each item fit on the scale based on their own belief about it. The distribution pattern of this Q sort was purposefully normal as is shown in Table 1. While some have objected to this 'forced' distribution, Brown (1971, 1985) has shown it has no statistical or methodological significance and its sole purpose it to simplify data analysis. Furthermore, Mc Keown & Thomas (1988) say this structure is "in keeping with the Law of Error [because] it is assumed that fewer issues are of great importance than issues of less or no significance. Thus, fewer items are found at the extremes." (p.35)

[1] Brown argues that it is important to have a + to – continuum so that it reflects the possibility that an item can be according to one's value (+); of no value (0); or *against* one's value (-). Having a scale that varies from 0 to 9 assumes the third option is not possible.

The 56 items used in the Q sort were statements derived from: (1) four marital quality scales (Marital Adjustment Test; Dyadic Adjustment Scale; Marital Quality Index; Marital Attitude Scale);[2] (2) the professional literature on Arab and Lebanese marriages; and (3) American and Lebanese focus groups. In the next section, I explain the rationale for deriving statements from the first two sources and describe the characteristics of the focus groups as well as the rationale for using such groups as a third source for developing items related to marital values.

Table 1: Distribution structure of the 56 item Q sort:

Most significant to me										Least Significant to me
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+I	+2	+3	+4	+5
ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM
ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM
ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM
	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	
		ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM	ITEM		
				ITEM	ITEM	ITEM				
				ITEM	ITEM	ITEM				
					ITEM					

Measures

When marital quality instruments first appeared in the 1930's, marriage was perceived as a sexual/romantic endeavor (Fincham, Beach & Kemp-Fincham, 1997) but as we have already discussed this represents a western view of marriage. This

[2] Some items in the aforementioned western scales do not contain descriptions that can reflect a possible marriage value but rather are questions about the state of a marriage. With such items, no statements of use can be derived. For example, item # 32 on the DAS asks: "which of the following items best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?" (Spanier & Cole, 1976).

is clearly a methodological problem for it represents a bias towards the European-American view of marriage. Furthermore, Fincham and Bradbury (1987) contend that measures of marital quality are problematic in their own right because they are based on fuzzy theory. Current research confirms this point as it is unclear what these marital quality instruments actually measure and whether or not different measures tap into different constructs.

Because of the ongoing debate as to which scale is most valid, I chose to draw items from all four scales to tap into marital values: the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT, Locke and Wallace, 1959); the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS, Spanier, 1976); the Marital Quality Index (MQI, Norton, 1983); and the Marital Attitude Scale (MAS, Braaten and Rosen, 1998). The DAS and the MAT were selected because of their widespread popularity; the MQI was selected because of its recent gain in research attention; and the MAS for its unique characteristic as a marital measure that directly taps into beliefs about marriage. Choosing items from these four scales is the first of three sources I used to develop the 56 statements about marriage values used in this study.

In what ways are marital quality questionnaires related to marital value systems? While, as we have seen, there are some conceptual problems with the use of such instruments to measure the quality of a marriage, they are still reflective of beliefs about marriage that have *some value to someone*. For example, items found on the DAS include statements on friendship, sex, in-laws, soul mate, confiding, all of which are believed to play some role in marriage. It is therefore warranted to incorporate such items in a marriage values scale.

Another method of broadening the range of marital values across cultures is to use the literature available on Arab and Lebanese marriages. Given the minimal interest Arab researchers have had in understanding the construct of marital values within their own cultures, it is not surprising that there is no available measure that was developed specifically to assess Arabic, let alone Lebanese, marital values. One unique and available source to derive marriage-related statements that are believed to reflect values of Lebanese individuals is through books and peer-reviewed papers. For example, items were derived from literary analysis of the character and values of Arabs in general (e.g., Hamady, 1960; Ammar, 1966; Tibi, 1981; Barakat, 1993) and that of Lebanese in particular (e.g., El-Solh, 2004). Key values derived from the aforementioned sources were: stability, reputation, honor, and respect. In addition, items were derived from research on Lebanese values conducted by sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists (e.g., Khalaf, 1971; Klat & Khudr, 1986; Joseph, 2004). The most prominent marital values derived from this source were: tradition, education, religion, sacrifice, and parental contribution in marital decisions. Relying strictly on such sources, however, lacks validity and it was therefore important that marriage statements for our Q sort analysis be derived from different sources.

A third source for tapping into the range of possible values about marriage was through the use of focus groups. A focus group is a method of gathering information about a particular topic in the informal setting of a discussion group and is facilitated by the investigator. This method is believed to be effective in acquiring new insight about a particular topic because it allows the integration of the particular subtleties of a culture in generating information (e.g., through jokes, back-and-forth arguments, and innuendos) in

a dynamic setting (Hyde, Howlett & Brady, 2005). Also, a focus group is a rich method of gathering information because it is not restricted by the rigidity of a formal interview or a close-ended questionnaire.

Generating beliefs about marital values ideas through a focus group was done in a two-step process. In the first part of the focus group, the primary investigator explained the nature of the study, indicating that its purpose was to investigate possible differences in how individuals might view marriage. Participants were informed that the purpose of the focus group was to have an open discussion on the topic and ask participants to discuss their particular viewpoints on what is important in marriage. In this part, facilitators did not disclose any particular hypotheses and the underlying theoretical rationale for suggesting it. The purpose of withholding this information from participants was to avoid any influence or contamination from the researcher that might lead to confirming instead of testing what is being investigated.

In a second phase of the discussion, the primary investigator revealed his hypotheses and encouraged participants to further discuss the topic in light of this new information. In this step, facilitators intervened to trigger more questions/answers and provide their own input.

The focus group discussion on marriage was facilitated by the primary investigator and two research assistants and conducted in a classroom at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. A total of 12 participants partook in the discussion, divided into two separate groups of six participants in each. One group consisted of Americans and the other consisted of Arabs. Conditions for participation in both groups were a minimum age of 18; committed to a 'romantic' relationship; and have a desire to marry. Data was

collected by one of the group facilitators who took down notes of ideas and thoughts raised in the discussion.

A total of three 'values' were derived from the Lebanese focus group (e.g., children, education), resulting in the development of six statements. Overall, the themes that transpired from the Lebanese group were the importance of children in marriage, respecting family members' opinion concerning marital matters, and ensuring fair distribution of responsibilities between husband and wife. A concern raised by the immigrant women in the group was that if women are reduced to having housewife responsibilities, the passionate aspect of marriage is at jeopardy.

No new values were derived from the American focus group. This was not unexpected since the western literature on marital values is extensive. Themes that were discussed were the importance of passion and communication in marriage as well as the need for husband and wife to work as a "team." A concern that was raised by all members of the American group was that love and passion are often at risk when husband or wife "forget the little things that matter," such as buying love cards, flowers, or surprise spouse with a night out.

Finally, a measure of acculturation was used with the Lebanese sample to tease out differences – if any – in levels of acculturation in the Lebanese sample between those who have been in the US for four years or less and those who have lived in the US for more than seven years. The American-International Relations Scale (AIRS, Sodowsky & Plake, 1991) was used in this study, as it is the only empirically tested instrument that measures how international people adapt to living in the US (Appendix F). More specifically, the AIRS measures how such people perceive their relationships with White

Americans and their "adjustments to the dominant society in values, behaviors, cultural practices" (p.208, Sodowsky & Plake, 1991). The AIRS has 3 subscales: Acculturation (11 items); Perceived Prejudice (20 items); and Language (3 items). The Acculturation subscale taps into preferences - among other things - for food, culture, festivals, connections with community and family. Items on the acculturation subscale contains statements such as "I celebrate American religious or social festivals more than I celebrate by country's religious or social festivals" and "I seek the friendship and support of people from my country in the city I am living in" (p.213, Sodowsky and Plake, 1991). The Perceived Prejudice subscale asks participant to indicate the extent to which they think Americans have discounted their customs, religion, national history or other relevant cultural heritage and include items that tap into experiences of stereotyping (e.g., "no matter how adjusted to American ways I may be, I will be seen as a 'foreigner' by Americans") and discrimination (e.g., "I resent that I am often overlooked for ... hiring, or promotion"). Items in the Language subscale includes ease of communication in a foreign language and language used when speaking to a person from one's country of origin (e.g., "when I am with people from my country I speak English only"). When the AIRS was originally developed, coefficient alphas varied from a low of .79, for the acculturation subscale, to a high of .89, for the full scale. In this study, alpha coefficients varied from a low of .72, for the full scale, to a high of .80, for the Language subscale.

Statistical Analyses

The main statistical procedure used in this study was a Q sort, a method of analysis that involves correlations, factoring and score computation.[3] It is important to

[3] For a description on how factor scores are computed see Mc Keown and Thomas (1988).

remember that Q is different than R since it involves the factoring of persons – not of tests – since the purpose of this technique is to find clusters of individuals who share the same beliefs. The factors that will eventually be extrapolated from the correlation matrix will represent the different ways in which people have similarly grouped statements about marital values. More specifically, each person's Q sort will be correlated to another person's Q sort to eventually generate a correlation matrix that would inform us of all the possible connections or lack thereof between any two pairs of Q. Factor analysis involves taking a 'step back' and seeing, more generally, if there are "family resemblances" between participants.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also used to determine whether or not there are significant group differences in marital values. This statistical analysis determined if there were differences between groups (i.e., Americans vs. Lebanese scores; men vs. women scores); and within groups (i.e., American men vs. American women scores; Lebanese men vs. Lebanese women scores; Older immigrant vs. newer immigrant scores).

An ANOVA was also used to compare acculturation scores of older immigrants (i.e., 7-plus years group) with newer ones (4 years or less group) as well as compare acculturation scores of Lebanese women and men.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

Overview

As described in the previous chapter, the current study that compares American and Lebanese marital values employed Q sort methodology. Because of the nature of the method - data analysis incorporates both quantitative and qualitative components - it is more appropriate to present results and an interpretation of its findings simultaneously. A general discussion and summary of this study's findings as well some of its recommendations and limitations will be presented in the final chapter.

Sample Description

A total of 90 individuals (45 men; 45 women) took part in this study. Participants were equally divided into three groups: American (N=30); 'newer' Lebanese immigrant (N=30); 'older' Lebanese immigrant (N=30). Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2. Analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were performed to test for group differences in key demographic variables. Results showed a significant group difference in age F (2, 87) = 9.25, $p < .001$; education F (2, 87) = 4.33, $p < .05$; years of marriage F (2, 87) = 8.23, $p < .001$; and income level F (2, 87) = 13.66, $p < .001$. Tukey post hoc tests revealed a significant difference in age between the two immigrant groups and the American and older immigrant groups; a significant difference in education between the two immigrant groups and the American and newer immigrant groups; a significant difference in years married between the two immigrant groups and between the American and older immigrant groups; and a significant difference of income between the two immigrant groups and between the American and newer immigrant groups.

Table 2: Means for Sample (N = 90).

Variable	*Age**	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs Education*	*Yrs in USA*	*Income Level (1to 7)***
Newer Immigrant (N=30)	37.7[a]	9.33[a]	15.60[a]	2.53	5.53[a]
Older Immigrant (N=30)	47.8[b]	20.20[b]	18.23[b]	19.53	6.50[b]
American (N=30)	41.8[a]	14.13[a]	18.73[b]	----	6.83[b]

* All values expressed as averages.
**Level brackets defined as follows: 1 = Less than $ 8,000; 2 = $8.001 to $ 15,000; 3 = $15.001 - $25,000; 4 = $25,001 - $35,000; 5 = $35,001 - $45,000; 6 = $45.001 - $55,000; 7 = $55,001 and over.

Two analyses of variance were also performed to determine if length of stay (measured in terms of less than 5 years; more than 7 years of residence in the US) or gender were factors in determining levels of acculturation to US culture. As indicated in Table 3, results revealed that length of stay was not a differentiating factor for acculturation when comparing scores on the overall scale of the American-International Relations Scale (AIRS, 34 items, Sodowsky & Plake, 1991), $F(1, 58) = 2.60$, $p < .11$. Also, there were no significant differences in scores for the Perceived Prejudice subscale, $F(1, 58) = 1.35$, $p = .24$; and the Acculturation subscale, $F(1, 58) = 1.44$, $p = .23$. The 3-item language subscale did separate the two Lebanese groups somewhat with the older immigrants having acculturated marginally faster to the language of the host country $F(1, 58) = 3.11$, $p = .08$. In all four analyses however, the difference of scores was in the expected direction, with newer immigrants having higher scores (meaning less acculturated) than the older immigrants.

Table 3: Means for Acculturation (Older vs. Newer Immigrants, N = 60).

Variable	Overall scale	prejudice	Acculturation	Language
Older Immigrants (N=30)	103.42	53.50	40.37	9.57[a]
Newer Immigrants (N=30)	110.62	57.47	42.57	10.63[b]

NOTE: Lower scores indicates greater acculturation

A second set of analyses compared men and women to determine if gender is a differentiating factor for acculturation (Table 4). Although no differences were found in comparing scores of men and women on the overall scale F (1, 58) = 2.70, p= .11; the perceived prejudice subscale F (1, 58) = 0.07, p = .79; and the language subscale F (1, 58) = 0.75, p = .39; a significant difference between men and women was found on the acculturation subscale F (1, 58) = 12.10, $p < .001$. Results indicated that men were more acculturated than women. The non-significant scores on the other three measures were in the same direction, i.e., women having higher score than men and thus were less acculturated. These results were not moderated by age as interaction tests on the overall acculturation scale and its three subscales yielded insignificant results.

Table 4: Means for Acculturation (Men vs. Women, N = 60).

Variable	Overall scale	prejudice	Acculturation	Language
Men (N=30)	103.50	55.07	38.53[a]	9.83
Women (N=30)	110.71	55.97	44.40[b]	10.37

Factor extraction and rotation

The next step was to address the main research question of the current study: The 56-item Q sort factor analysis of marital values. The first step in the process was factor

analyzing the 90 completed Q sorts. This process resulted in the extraction of seven factors. The unrotated factor matrix is presented in Appendix G. After rotation, the first two factors had multiple persons with significant loadings defining each of them; Factor III had one person defining it; and Factors IV thru VII were undefined, as no person significantly loaded on any of them. Because factors IV thru VII were insignificant, they were disregarded from the analysis. Furthermore, since the interpretation of a factor with only one person defining it seemed like a stretch, factor III was also dropped from the analysis.[4] As a result, this study will only focus on presenting and interpreting results for factors I and II.

Factor rotation was performed using the centroid method, otherwise known as the judgmental or manual method. While this method is rarely used in traditional psychometric tests, it is the method of choice for the proponents of the Q approach for data analysis and interpretation. Both Stephenson (1961a) and Brown (1980) argue that it is the most appropriate form of factor rotation as it is in line with a theory-based method of scientific investigation. Since one often begins a piece of work with a certain idea (or theory) and subsequently develops particular hypotheses to test it, rotation of factors should be performed at the discretion of the researcher. To use this study as an example, if our research question aims to show that Lebanese and Americans differ in their perception of what is important in marriage, then *any* factor rotation that confirms this hypothesis is warranted.

[4] Some Q sort analysis have interpreted a factor with a single person defining it (see Brown, 1980, for a good example) but such inclusion is typically warranted when it contributes to a better understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. In this particular study, there was no reason to suggest that the single loader on Factor III fit that criterion of inclusion.

It is important to note that theoretical rotations (as they are sometimes called) should not and *do not* lead to 'accidental' findings. As Brown points out, "it is one thing to find gold while seining for minnows in a stream, and quite another to *find* gold while panning for it" (1980, p.237). In other words, rotations are performed systematically rather than haphazardly in a direction that best closes the gap between data and theory. In contrast to this approach, is the automatic method of factor rotation (e.g., Varimax) that uses a unique mathematical solution – the one that leads to the 'purest' possible loadings - irrespective of theory or hypotheses. One of the downfalls of using automatic rotation is that it removes the investigator from the investigation in a way that she no longer operates as an active participant in the project (Brown, 1980). This results in the researcher having no control over her data, an undesirable consequence according to Brown because the growth of knowledge has always taken into account a researcher's "intuition, hunches and other subjective factors" (p. 238) that all are integral parts of scientific inquiry.

The matrix of the rotated factors of interest and the demographic characteristics of each of the 90 Q sorts (or participants) is presented in Table 5. As indicated by bold characters, 35 Q sorts defined Factor I (21 % of total variance) while 36 Q sorts defined Factor II (18 % of total variance) bringing the total number of participants who loaded on either factor to 71. This means a total of 19 participants did not load on Factor I or Factor II. Their responses will be examined in a separate section.

Table 5: Factor Loadings and demographic characteristics of all three groups (N = 90).

Subject	*Nationality*	*F1*	*F2*	Sex	*Age*	*Educ. (Yrs)*	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs In US*	*Income level*
1	Lebanese	.21	**.48**	F	35	19	14	7	4
2	American	.30	.33	F	47	16	8	ALL	7
3	Lebanese	.25	**.68**	F	40	16	13	13	7
4	Lebanese	.26	**.49**	F	47	20	5	30	7
5	Lebanese	-.02	**.73**	F	51	19	29	18	7
6	Lebanese	.34	**.66**	M	60	19	29	19	7
7	Lebanese	**.66**	.32	F	34	20	8	8	7
8	Lebanese	**.69**	.27	M	42	20	8	17	7
9	Lebanese	.00	**.59**	F	39	12	13	13	5
10	American	**.52**	.20	M	39	21	9	ALL	7
11	Lebanese	.01	**.46**	F	78	7	58	58	7
12	Lebanese	**.53**	.40	F	43	15	22	10	6
13	Lebanese	-.02	**.60**	M	48	15	22	27	5
14	Lebanese	.17	**.53**	F	43	11	20	28	5
15	Lebanese	.23	**.42**	F	42	16	15	24	7
16	Lebanese	**.61**	.11	F	44	25	10	10	7
17	Lebanese	.35	.39	F	53	16	30	10	7
18	Lebanese	.10	**.56**	M	57	14	30	10	7
19	American	.42	.38	F	39	16	12	ALL	7
20	Lebanese	.34	**.55**	M	43	17	12	25	7
21	Lebanese	**.75**	.24	M	42	25	9	22	7
22	Lebanese	.44	**.47**	M	57	24	29	29	7
23	Lebanese	**.57**	.22	F	54	18	29	29	7
24	Lebanese	-.04	**.47**	F	40	10	23	.5	5
25	Lebanese	.19	**.48**	M	45	10	23	.5	5
26	Lebanese	-.17	**.66**	M	44	12	13	18	7
27	Lebanese	**.68**	.32	M	39	12	31	20	7
28	Lebanese	.02	**.38**	F	48	17	30	31	7
29	Lebanese	-.23	.13	M	38	19	11	.5	7
30	Lebanese	.21	.50	M	60	25	30	10	7
31	Lebanese	.34	.58	M	52	17	24	27	7
32	Lebanese	**.55**	.41	F	51	15	30	20	7

Subject	*Nationality*	*F1*	*F2*	Sex	*Age*	*Educ. (Yrs)*	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs In US*	*Income level*
33	Lebanese	.30	.26	M	65	25	31	20	7
34	Lebanese	**.55**	-.10	M	42	30	4	30	7
35	Lebanese	.04	.30	M	40	32	13	32	5
36	American	**.61**	.35	M	46	18	14	ALL	7
37	American	**.65**	.04	F	46	18	8	ALL	7
38	American	**.67**	.22	F	53	16	30	ALL	7
39	American	**.67**	.37	M	54	16	30	ALL	7
40	American	**.64**	.39	M	47	14	28	ALL	7
41	American	**.71**	.27	F	46	16	28	ALL	7
42	Lebanese	**.42**	.14	F	33	17	5	.5	6
43	Lebanese	-.01	**.52**	F	43	18	7	3	6
44	Lebanese	.11	**.76**	M	39	17	7	2	7
45	Lebanese	.29	**.54**	F	40	18	7	2	7
46	American	.45	.12	F	31	17	6	ALL	7
47	American	**.67**	.29	M	31	18	6	ALL	7
48	American	**.71**	-.05	M	35	19	9	ALL	6
49	American	**.69**	.11	F	35	19	9	ALL	6
50	Lebanese	.18	**.63**	F	43	17	3	3	7
51	Lebanese	**.58**	.39	F	27	17	3	3	5
52	Lebanese	.35	**.58**	F	31	17	4	4	7
53	American	.49	**.60**	M	33	16	4	ALL	7
54	American	**.67**	.11	F	47	20	21	ALL	7
55	American	**.77**	.13	F	50	22	28	ALL	7
56	American	.29	.42	M	46	17	25	38	5
57	Lebanese	.18	**.67**	M	42	11	19	8	4
58	Lebanese	-.46	.21	M	70	7	35	2	4
59	Lebanese	.21	**.58**	F	54	14	35	2	4
60	Lebanese	.00	**.59**	F	35	17	2	2	7
61	Lebanese	.05	**.63**	F	23	15	4	4	7
62	Lebanese	.41	.47	M	43	16	9	4	5
63	Lebanese	.28	**.53**	F	37	13	9	4	5
64	American	**.69**	-.01	M	34	19	3	ALL	7
65	American	**.74**	.12	F	33	20	3	ALL	7
66	American	**.58**	.38	M	41	16	10	ALL	7

Subject	*Nationality*	*F1*	*F2*	Sex	*Age*	*Educ. (Yrs)*	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs In US*	*Income level*
67	American	**.69**	.08	F	39	23	12	ALL	7
68	American	**.66**	.20	M	38	22	12	ALL	7
69	Lebanese	.23	**.49**	M	31	19	1	4	6
70	Lebanese	**.55**	.16	M	32	21	2	4	7
71	American	.38	.13	F	53	16	25	ALL	7
72	Lebanese	**.68**	.41	F	40	20	13	1	3
73	Lebanese	**.74**	.26	M	40	20	13	2	3
74	American	.48	.18	M	55	21	29	ALL	7
75	American	**.68**	.30	F	57	22	29	ALL	7
76	American	.56	.34	F	26	22	1	ALL	7
77	American	.42	.28	M	27	16	1	ALL	7
78	American	**.64**	.23	M	34	21	3	ALL	7
79	American	**.63**	.34	F	37	21	3	ALL	7
80	Lebanese	.35	**.53**	M	35	18	1	4	7
81	Lebanese	.09	**.53**	M	43	22	14	4	4
82	American	.50	.31	M	57	15	18	ALL	6
83	Lebanese	.23	**.64**	M	31	22	1	1	6
84	Lebanese	.11	**.53**	M	37	12	10	2	4
85	Lebanese	-.11	**.48**	F	36	12	10	1	4
86	Lebanese	-.04	.19	F	33	11	11	3	5
87	Lebanese	.08	.17	M	40	10	11	4	5
88	Lebanese	**.62**	.27	M	33	22	6	1	4
89	Lebanese	.15	**.53**	M	31	11	1	4	7
90	Lebanese	.05	**.58**	F	29	16	1	4	7

Factor Scores

A final step before the data can be interpreted is the computation of factor scores. A factor score is an estimate of the best representative score of a statement, taking into account the scores of all respondents who loaded on the factor. This score will vary between the values of -5 (least important to me) to + 5 (most important to me), because that was the interval used when participants completed their individual Q sort. In

determining the score that defines each item, more weight is given to the Q sorts with the highest loadings. This is because the higher the loading, the closer (or 'purer') the approximation to the factor is. For example, Q sort # 55 has the highest loading of the 36 Q sorts that loaded on factor I (.77) and thus was given the greatest weight in determining this item's final average score. Computing factor scores will result in factor arrays that represents the score of each of the 56 items for Factors I and II (Table 6).

Table 6: Factor Arrays for 56 Item Q sort (2 factor solution):*

STATEMENT	FACTOR 1 SCORE	FACTOR 2 SCORE
1- A married couple should be financially independent from extended family	3	3
2- It is important that parents have a say in who their son or daughter marry	-4	2
3- If I compromise with my spouse this means I am disloyal to my own values or beliefs.	-5	-3
4- It is not appropriate to display physical affection to one's spouse in front of others.	-3	0
5- While having friends is important in marriage, I find it more valuable to have close relationships with relatives	-1	1
6- I can still be happy in my marriage even if my partner is of a different religion	3	1
7- Married folks should respect family traditions even thought they might not always agree with some of them	-1	2
8- Leisure time between spouses is best when shared with other close relatives	-2	-2
9- I don't care if my spouse is highly educated because what really matters is that we love each other	1	2
10- For a marriage to be of real value, it must be complemented with children	-3	5
11- Sexual intimacy is important in marriage because it allows husband and wife to have children and expand their families	-2	3
12- More than anything else, romance is important in marriage	1	3
13- It is important for a married couple to share goals and	4	4

STATEMENT	FACTOR 1 SCORE	FACTOR 2 SCORE
beliefs independently of those of the extended family		
14- In marriage, I rely on my friends more than my relatives. After all, I was free to chose my friends but not free to chose my relatives	1	0
15- I don't care about how much money my spouse has. I married for love not for money	5	5
16- Even in marriage, there are some things that are still private from my spouse	0	-2
17- In-laws play a really important role in the life of a married couple	1	-1
18- An older sibling's opinion is important in making decision about marriage	-3	0
19- For my marriage to be valuable, I need to feel it is unique	0	1
20- I don't see the big dealing in kissing; I don't think it is that important in marriage	-4	-4
21- I wouldn't stay in an unhappy marriage just because it is stable	2	0
22- My friends play an important supporting role in my marriage	0	-5
23- When you marry someone, you also marry their family	0	-2
24- In marriage, spouses should feel deeply connected – as if they are soul mates	4	5
25- I don't think romance between husband and wife is a really important aspect of their relationship	-4	-4
26- A marriage that includes regular sexual activity is important to maintaining a solid bond between husband and wife	5	4
27- For spouses to be close, it is important that they confide in each other	5	4
28- If husband and wife want to be happy, there relationship must be a passionate one	2	3
29- My spouse and I are comfortable displaying physical affection in front of others	3	-3
30- A stable marriage is more important than a happy marriage	-2	-4
31- A happy marriage does not need to feel unique	0	-2
32- I f my spouse had a 'bad' reputation, it would be a blow to our marriage	-1	-1
33- It is hard to manage or conceive of a marriage between spouses of different religions	-5	0
34- There are many factors that go into finding the 'right'	1	1

STATEMENT	FACTOR 1 SCORE	FACTOR 2 SCORE
partner so I don't think finding a 'soul mate' is enough to ensure a happy marriage		
35- In marriage, it is important for spouses to maintain physical contact such as kissing	4	1
36- Family honor is an outdated value. I am only interested in honoring the vows of my marriage	0	0
37- It is important that my spouse and I spend a good deal of 'alone time' together	4	2
38- For marriage to succeed, spouses need only be committed to each other	2	3
39- It is OK to follow a family tradition as long as it is in harmony with spouses' beliefs	1	1
40- In marriage, husband and wife should have similar levels of education	0	-1
41- It is better if the goals and beliefs of a couple match those of their close relative	-1	-3
42- It is hard for me to imagine having values that are independent from those of my parents and other close relatives	-3	0
43- For spouses to be close it is equally important that they disclose information to themselves as it is to significant others	-4	-4
44- Passion is not the most important aspect of a husband-wife relationship	-1	-1
45- I don't care what others think of my spouse's reputation. What matters is what I think of her/him	1	2
46- Honor means more than just 'defending' my spouse. It means defending the beliefs and values of both of our extended families	-2	1
47- In marriage I think it is more important that spouses spend time together in the company of other relatives than spend it on their own	-3	-5
48- Marriage means commitment to both your spouse and his/her family	-1	-2
49- I value leisure alone with my spouse more than leisure with a group	3	0
50- I don't think parents should have a say in who you marry	2	-1
51- I think it is acceptable that every now and then spouses rely on their relatives for financial support	0	-1
52- You don't have to have children to be happy in marriage	3	-3
53- I think how much money one's spouse has is important. 'Marrying up' is often a gain	-5	-5

STATEMENT	FACTOR 1 SCORE	FACTOR 2 SCORE
54- My relatives play an important supporting role in my marriage	-1	-3
55- You can't just say "I give as much as I take" in marriage because spouses must sometimes sacrifice	2	4
56- Spouses should value the opinion of their older sibling(s) in marriage matters	-2	-1

* Factor scores ranging from -5 to +5.
-5 = "least important value"; 0 = "neutral value"; +5 = "most important value".

Factor I: Results and Interpretation

20 of 30 Americans (66 %) and 15 of 60 Lebanese-Americans (25 %) loaded on Factor I (Table 7). Irrespective of nationality, men and women equally represent this factor. In comparing the newer with the older Lebanese immigrants, the endorsement of Factor I was slightly greater for 'older' immigrants (N=9) than it was for 'newer' immigrants (N= 6).

Table 7: Means for Factor I Loadings (N = 35).

Variable	*Age*	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs Educ.*	*Yrs in USA*	*Income Level (1to 7)*	*Gender*	
						M	*F*
American (N=20)	42.1	14,8	20.6	----	6.9	10	10
Older Immigrant (N=9)	43.4	14.8	20.5	17.1	6.9	4	5
Newer Immigrant (N=6)	34.2	6,8	19.5	1.9	4.7	3	3

So what marital values do the persons who loaded on factor I adhere too? The most obvious glue that attaches those people together is a strong belief that physical proximity and other forms of intimacy are essential in a marital relationship. This viewpoint is reflected in a strong endorsement of *all* statements that reflect this position:

27- For spouses to be close, it is important that they confide in each other (+5).
26- A marriage that includes regular sexual activity is important to maintaining a solid bond between husband and wife (+5).
24- In marriage, spouses should feel deeply connected – as if they are soul mates (+4).
35- In marriage, it is important for spouses to maintain physical contact such as kissing (+4).

The consistency of this position is also made obvious by strongly disagreeing with a statement that minimizes the importance of physical intimacy:

20- I don't see the big dealing in kissing; I don't think it is that important in marriage *(-4).*

Another item about intimacy further shows its value in marriage. In the statement below, we notice that its importance is such that it takes precedence over other considerations such as discretion of behavior:

4- It is not appropriate to display physical affection to one's spouse in front of others (-3).

A related value to intimacy which was also endorsed by the 35 men and women who loaded on factor I is the romantic aspect of marriage. For these individuals, an important part of marriage is its passionate side and the idea that one's relationship is unique or irreplaceable. This belief is reflected in a number of statements:

15- I don't care about how much money my spouse has. I married for love not for money *(+5).*
25- I don't think romance between husband and wife is a really important aspect of their relationship *(-4).*
28- If husband and wife want to be happy, there relationship must be a passionate one *(+ 2).*

Looking at answers to two other statements, however, indicates romance is not necessarily the most important aspect of marriage. Responses to items 12 and 34 suggest there might be other marital values of relevance.

12- More than anything else, romance is important in marriage (+1).
34- There are many factors that go into finding the 'right' partner so I don't think finding a 'soul mate' is enough to ensure a happy marriage (1).

So if finding one's soul mate and being romantic is not the whole marital 'story' what other value(s) matter to Factor 1 proponents? A closer look at the 35 defining responses shows that the notion of being free to think and behave independently from the influence of others is another cherished value. In other words, of importance to these individuals is the idea that marital affairs should only implicate (or take into account) those *in* the marriage - not a parent, a relative or some social norm or tradition.

13- It is important for a married couple to share goals and beliefs independently of those of the extended family (+4).
18- An older sibling's opinion is important in making decision about marriage (-3).
42- It is hard for me to imagine having values that are independent from those of my parents and other close relatives (-3).
45- I don't care what others think of my spouse's reputation. What matters is what I think of her/him (1).

Furthermore, individuals who have defined Factor I do not only value the freedom to think and act as they see fit in marriage, but also during the decision-making stage that will determine *who* they marry. This can be seen in opposing views to the following two statements:

50- I don't think parents should have a say in who you marry (+2).
2- It is important that parents have a say in who their son or daughter marry (-4).

With the idea that marriage is a private enterprise that emphasizes the needs and objectives of the couple, one wonders how its value might be altered with the addition of a new component to the marriage, i.e., an offspring. The question is particularly interesting because having a child might be explained in at least two different ways: As an integral and necessary component of the marriage (i.e., a natural way to 'complete' it

or a duty to procreate) and therefore important; or as an additional element to the marriage that may or may not be considered as valuable. Those who define Factor I seem clearly inclined to choose the later explanation:

> 10- For a marriage to be of real value, it must be complemented with children *(-3)*
> 52- You don't have to have children to be happy in marriage *(+3)*.

Finally, the statement below indicates that physical closeness (which has already been identified as valuable to those who loaded on Factor I) is in fact of importance irrespective of its procreating value.

> 11- Sexual intimacy is important in marriage because it allows husband and wife to have children and expand their families *(-2)*.

With an endorsement of the values of intimacy, romance, and independence, the views valued by 66 % of the American sample (20 out of 30) and 25 % of the Lebanese sample (15 out of 60) depicts a picture of individuals who view marriage as a powerful bond between husband and wife, one that seems singly centered on the needs and desires of the couple. Based on our review of the literature, there seems little doubt that the positions expressed by these individuals conform and confirm with what is commonly believed as representative of a 'western' view of marriage: What matters most and foremost in such relationships is its nuclear aspect, i.e., the idea that intimacy between two individuals is the highest form of connection between people (Gillis, 2004). Also in concordance with a western perspective of marriage is the idea that children are not perceived as an integral component of the marriage, a requirement so to speak, as marriage's first role is not to expand families but rather to create physical and psychological closeness.

Based on the above, our first hypothesis that suggested that Americans are the ones who will value romanticism and the independence that results from the nuclear aspect of marital relationships has been somewhat confirmed, given that a majority of Americans have endorsed these marital values. It should also be noted that a considerable amount of Lebanese have also endorsed this perspective of marriage since 15 of the 60 participants of the two immigrant groups agree with the marital principles described above. As hypothesized Americans value romance *more* than Lebanese do, however a significant segment of the latter group also endorsed the more western values. It was also hypothesized that there are other values of similar or greater importance to Lebanese couples such as the role of family and the importance of the interconnectedness of its members. As we discuss the demographic characteristics of participants who defined Factor II and examine key loadings, the marital values landscape and its cultural variations will become clearer.

Also of note in the characteristics of the individuals who have defined Factor I is that it failed to distinguish gender differences in loadings. As noted earlier, men and women are very much alike in how they endorse the values expressed through Factor I (17 men; 18 women). This finding is neither moderated by nationality (10 American men vs. 10 American women; 7 Lebanese men vs. 8 Lebanese women) nor by immigration status (3 newer immigrant men vs. 3 newer imnigrant women; 4 'older' immigrant men vs. 3 'older' immigrant women). This result disproves our hypothesis that women would endorse the romantic and relational part of marriage more strongly than men.

Factor II: Results and Interpretation

The demographic characteristics of the participants who loaded on factor II are presented in Table 8. Of the 36 participants who loaded on this factor, 35 of them where from one or the other of the two Lebanese groups (58 % of the total Lebanese sample). Within this nationality group, 19 were newer immigrants (8 men; 11 women) and 16 were older immigrants (7 men; 9 women). Americans endorsement of this factor was almost non-existent with only 1 of the 30 individuals endorsing it (3 % of the total US sample).

Table 8: Means for Factor II Loadings (N = 36).

Variable	*Age*	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs Educ.*	*Yrs in USA*	*Income Level (1to 7)*	*Gender*	
						M	*F*
Newer Immigrant (N=19)	37.0	8.5	15.2	2.7	5.9	8	11
Older Immigrant (N=16)	48.4	21.6	15.4	22.4	6.3	7	9
American (N=1)	33.0	4,0	16.0	----	7.0	1	0

Conceptually, a striking difference between the two factors is that while the first was represented by both nationalities this one is exclusively Lebanese – with, as mentioned earlier, one exception. Thus, as we discuss the particular value system of this group, it is essential to keep in mind that we are in effect describing Lebanese values of marriage.

With respect to valuing intimacy, the 36 men and women look very much like the 35 individuals who loaded on the previous factor. Looking at the first three items that were described in our discussion of Factor I, we clearly notice that the Lebanese who

endorsed this factor think this value is also of great importance. (Presented on the right side and in brackets is how Factor I proponents scored on the same item).

> 27- For spouses to be close, it is important that they confide in each other +4 *(+5)*
> 26- A marriage that includes regular sexual activity is important to maintaining a solid bond between husband and wife *+4 (+5).*
> 24- In marriage, spouses should feel deeply connected – as if they are soul mates +5 *(+4).*

The Lebanese who endorsed this factor also share very similar views about romance with those who loaded on Factor I. Thus, the passionate aspect of marriage is also valued by this group, and, on some occasions even more so than those who defined the first factor:

> 15- I don't care about how much money my spouse has. I married for love not for money *+5 (+5).*
> 25- I don't think romance between husband and wife is a really important aspect of their relationship *-4 (-4).*
> 28- If husband and wife want to be happy, there relationship must be a passionate one +3 *(+ 2).*
> 12- More than anything else, romance is important in marriage +3 *(+1).*

Based on the endorsement of the seven items just described, the two factor groups appear to have very similar beliefs about the connection between marriage and intimacy. But a closer look at related statements indicates that while both groups appreciate intimacy, the two groups differ in the endorsement of its various aspects. For example, response patterns to some items indicate that Factor I and Factor II loaders agree about the importance of the psychological aspect of love (e.g., spiritual or soul mate type intimacies, romance) but disagree about its physical appreciation. More specifically, Factor I proponents equally endorse both aspects of love (physical and psychological)

while Factor II proponents believe its physical appreciation is not of value when expressed publicly:

> 29- My spouse and I are comfortable displaying physical affection in front of others. -3 *(+3).*
> 4- It is not appropriate to display physical affection to one's spouse in front of others 0 *(-3).*

Thus, when it comes to evaluating the worth of physical closeness between spouses when it is expressed *socially,* the 35 Lebanese who defined factor II clearly disagree with their Factor I counterparts. And by the introduction of a social element that resulted in altering the physical connectedness of some of them towards their spouse, we begin to see that the majority of Lebanese disagree with the majority of Americans on this particular aspect of marriage. As we look closer to other socially-related items, we notice that the gap between the two groups' value system increases. More specifically, we notice that the family's role in shaping beliefs and decisions about marriage is central in explaining differences between Factor I and Factor II proponents:

> 42- It is hard for me to imagine having values that are independent from those of my parents and other close relatives 0 *(-3).*

By indicating neutrality towards the role of family in affecting how they view marriage matters, the Lebanese do not outrightly reject the idea that relatives might influence their marital values. But 'relatives' remain a broad term that includes in-laws, distant cousins and half-brothers, so including it with 'parents' can be misleading. When we look at statements that are more specific about which family members the opinions and beliefs of which are valued, the response pattern changes.

> 50- I don't think parents should have a say in who you marry -1 *(+2).*

2- It is important that parents have a say in who their son or daughter marry 2 *(-4).*

The interconnectedness of family members, through the sharing of decisions between parents and their children, is another indication that this group does not view marriage as a private matter which only involves the couple, the way Factor I proponents conceptualized it. And when it comes to their views on the value of creating new familial connections through children, their answer is unequivocal.

10- For a marriage to be of real value, it must be complemented with children + 5 *(-3).*

From the 56 items that comprised this Q sort, statement number 10 was the one which most polarized the two factors. This discrepancy in belief systems further crystallizes the idea that marriage, for the Lebanese who defined Factor II, is not only a relation between two people in love, but also a way to create intimate connections with other close relatives and expand families. The factor score of the next statement is another indication that the presence of children is a condition for a satisfying marriage.

52- You don't have to have children to be happy in marriage -3 *(+3).*

Another essential difference between the two factors is how sexual relations are viewed. As discussed earlier, Factor I proponents viewed the role of physical closeness (e.g., sexual intimacy) as a powerful way for two individuals to bond, the most fundamental of human interactions according to the 'western' view of marital relations. But for the majority of the Lebanese who participated in this study, sexual intimacy is more a means to an end, a way to engender more powerful bonds through having children.

11- Sexual intimacy is important in marriage because it allows husband and wife to have children and expand their families + 3 *(-2)*.

The importance attributed to the role of parents and children in marriage has notable repercussions on how relationships with other individuals are viewed. For instance, the Lebanese who defined factor II completely disagree with the idea that friends are a source of support in marriage and don't think in-laws play an important role in their marriage.

22- My friends play an important supporting role in my marriage -5 *(0)*
17- In-laws play a really important role in the life of a married couple. -1 *(1)*

There is no room for speculation as to the role of friends for the majority of the Lebanese who participated in this study. Worthy of commentary however is an apparently paradoxical response pattern of both groups to statement # 17. For why would individuals deny the role of family members in marriage matters - in this case in-laws - when even the majority of Americans, who strongly believe in the independent decision making power of the couple, acknowledge that they have a say in the marriage? I suggest two possible answers to this question. First, in-laws are not typically perceived as *core* family in Arab culture since they are not blood relatives. Also, our review of the empirical literature on Lebanese marital patterns showed that the majority of them continue to believe that the best spouse match is a first cousin (Josef, 1993a) an indication of great interconnectedness to relatives of blood. Secondly, the weak endorsement of this item by the Americans who loaded on Factor I is probably due to a better understanding of this statement's meaning. On a number of occasions for instance, American participants asked whether in-laws' "important role" should also include negative roles. A verbal clarification was eventually given by saying that this statement

should indeed be understood in its broadest meaning. Comprehended in both its positive and negative understanding, it is possible that some of the participants' Factor I scores reflect answers that express a dislike of in-laws involvement but an acknowledgement still of their influence on the marriage. No such clarification was requested by the Lebanese of Factor II, and given that they have a lesser command of the language, they might have interpreted it to mean its more accessible meaning.

The importance of the role of immediate family in the conceptualization of marriage indicates that the lives of spouses are intertwined with that of their parents and other relatives of blood. With a lack of emphasis on independence of thought and action, one can expect that those who favored Factor II might sacrifice personal values to match those of the family group. The statement below demonstrates how this is the case and how this contrasts with how Factor I people think:

7- Married folks should respect family traditions even thought they might not always agree with some of them. 2 *(-1)*.

Another statement, this one related to the specific value of honor, further distances the two factors' perspective on the role of family in marriage:

46- Honor means more than just 'defending' my spouse. It means defending the beliefs and values of both of our extended families. 1 *(-2)*.

While "family traditions" can be understood to mean honoring the marital values that are idiosyncratic to one's family, it can also mean respecting broader beliefs, such as general societal norms. One prototypical example of such a broader social value is religious belief. With evidence showing that Lebanese overwhelmingly marry within their religion, close to 90 % according to one study (Klat & Khudr, 1986), despite no

religious differences in the conceptualization of marriage,[5] it can be expected that many Lebanese will forego marrying for love if their 'soul mate' is of a different religious denomination because so is the cultural norm. In the two statements below, the indifferent and weak endorsement answers of the Lebanese indicates that, for them, love does not 'conquer all' and contrasts strongly- yet again - with the views of the majority of American and the Lebanese who defined factor I.

> 6- I can still be happy in my marriage even if my partner is of a different religion + 1 *(+3).*
> 33- It is hard to manage or conceive of a marriage between spouses of different religions 0 *(-5).*

So far we have only given cursory importance to the 15 Lebanese who chose Factor I, the loading which reflected an appreciation of more typically western values about marriage. While there is no need to compare Americans across the two factors because only one American loaded on Factor II, it is essential to look at differences between the Lebanese, based on factor loadings, since they have significant representations in both. For this purpose, an analysis of variance was conducted, specifically comparing the characteristics of the 15 Lebanese who loaded on factor I, with the 35 who loaded on Factor II.

---

[5] One of the intents of this study, although not explicitly hypothesized because of expected sample limitations, was also to show that religion per se is not a factor in shaping views of marriage and showing that Lebanese Christians are *not* more westernized than Lebanese Muslims as it is commonly believed. But because of the limited number of Muslims who participated in this study (N=9) such comparison was not really possible. Interesting to note however that all Muslims in the newer immigrant category (N=4) and two Muslims in the older immigrant category (N=5) loaded on ('western') Factor I. Another point worth making is that average years of education for all Muslims who loaded on this factor (N=6) was 20.5 against 17 years of education for the entire Lebanese sample (N=60).

Table 9 below shows the demographic characteristics of the Lebanese who loaded on Factors I (N=15) or Factor II (N=35). In comparing those two groups, we

Table 9: Means for Lebanese Factor loading (N = 50).

Variable	*Age*	*Yrs Married*	*Yrs Educ.*	*Yrs in USA*	*Income level (1to 7)*	*Gender*	
						M	*F*
Factor I (N=15)	39.7	11.6	20.1[a]	11.0	6.0	7	8
Factor II (N=35)	42.2	14.5	15.3[b]	11.6	6.1	15	20

notice remarkable similarities. They are very close in age, have the same income level and both groups have lived in the US an average of 11 years. And although they seem discrepant in terms of how long they have been married (11.6 yrs for Factor I vs. 14.5 for Factor II) this difference is not significant. It is worth pointing out that the direction is consistent with the empirical evidence that individuals who have been more recently married best fit the characteristics defined by Factor I.

One significant difference between the two groups of Lebanese is level of education. More specifically, the 15 Lebanese who endorsed Factor I have significantly more education than the 35 Lebanese who endorsed Factor II, $F(1, 28) = 16.57$, $p < .001$, with an average of close to five *more* years of education for those who loaded on Factor I. Furthermore, an analysis of variance that compared scores of Lebanese immigrants who loaded on Factor I (N=15) with those who *did not* load on this factor (N=45) showed that

Factor I endorsers were significantly *more* educated than those who did not endorse this factor F (1, 58) = 9.22, $p < .01$.

Another variable of interest that might help explain the difference between endorsing Factor I or Factor II for the Lebanese is acculturation. While we have seen that time spent in the US did not distinguish choice of factors we must also be careful not to assume that equal time spent in the US signifies equal levels of acculturation. For we have already discussed that time, used as a single variable to determine acculturation, is unreliable (Roysircar, email correspondence, 2006). This is because the process of acculturation is a complex one and does not always progress in a linear way from culture of origin to host country - particularly when it comes to changing one's core value system or attitudinal beliefs (Keefe, 1980). When we do compare acculturation *scores* between the Lebanese who loaded on factor I and those who loaded on Factor II we do find a significant difference between the two factor groups. Results indicated that those who loaded on Factor I were significantly more acculturated then those who loaded on the (Lebanese) Factor II (Table 10). This was the case when comparing scores on the overall AIRS scale, F (1, 48) = 15.95, $p < .001$, and two of its three subscales - Acculturation, F (1, 48) = 7.90, $p < .01$; and Perceived Prejudice F (1, 48) = 9.87, $p < .01$. These results provide some evidence that the 35 Lebanese who loaded on Factor II might not view marriage as the majority of Americans because they remained rooted in their beliefs, irrespective of time spent in the US, while the 15 Lebanese who loaded along side the

majority of Americans had, irrespective of time spent in the US, acculturated faster to the host culture by being more receptive to some of their values and beliefs.

Table 10: American-International Relations Scale by Lebanese Factor loading (N = 50).

Variable	Overall scale	Perceived Prejudice	Acculturation	Language
Factor I (N=15)	94.2[a]	47.0[a]	38.0[a]	9.2
Factor II (N=35)	112.1[b]	58.0[b]	43.6[b]	10.5

NOTE: Lower scores indicates greater acculturation

With its almost exclusive Lebanese character, Factor II has yielded a profile of individuals that confirm our hypothesis that citizens of this country value an 'eastern' perspective of marriage. While we have seen that the 35 Lebanese who have defined this factor also cherish the traditionally western beliefs of romance and passion, they were reluctant to express their physical intimacy openly. Thus, and by distinguishing between psychological and physical behaviors, we noticed that the Lebanese take into account others when expressing their love. This 'other' essentially takes the form of one's immediate family (i.e., parents) whose role in shaping one's view of marriage is both accepted and appreciated. There is therefore an additional element in marriage over and above the traditionally western romantic aspect of love which, as we have seen, is appreciated by both groups, that is of value to the Lebanese. And while it is possible that both values can coexist without conflict (i.e., the importance of love and the role of family in shaping decisions about marriage), one can also imagine situations when one's personal feelings of love and romance towards a future spouse might come at odds with one's family views.

An interesting observation in this study is the Factor II response pattern of participant # 53, an American male. His Q sort is the only significant loading for an American on this factor. This fact is noteworthy because he is one of three Americans who married a Lebanese. Thus, he lacks 'Americaness' in one important respect, since his beliefs have been shared (in his case, through 5 years of marriage) with a Lebanese woman who, for that matter, also loaded on Factor II.

The 'Others': Response Patterns of 19 Non-pure Loaders

As we have seen, a total of 71 participants defined Factors 1 or 2 leaving 19 participants with response patterns that have not yet been interpreted. While the proportion of 'pure' loadings for this Q sort is quite high (78 %) it remains of value to look at how the remaining participants viewed marriage. It is particularly interesting in the case of this study for a large majority of the remaining participants had high correlation coefficients in at least one of the two factors. But, as noted earlier, their responses were not pure (i.e., contained elements of both factors) and could not be considered as defining either factors. Reproduced in Table 11 below is the loading on Factor I for each of the 19 participant who did not load on Factor I in decreasing order of magnitude.

A glance at the table reveals an interesting response pattern: The six highest loadings are from American participants and the six lowest are from Lebanese participants. Factor I, as we have already extensively discussed, is the factor that represents the belief that passion and romance and independence of thought and action are key aspects of a martial relationship, a view that strikes a chord with a western perspective of marriage. Thus, while the patterns of the 19 participants described above

Table 11: Non-pure loadings: Factor 1 coefficients and demographic characteristics (N = 19).

Subject	*Nationality*	*F1*	Sex	*Age*	*Educ. (Yrs)*	*Yrs Marrie*	*Yrs In US*	*Income level*
76	American	.56	F	26	22	1	ALL	7
82	American	.50	M	57	15	18	ALL	6
74	American	.48	M	55	21	29	ALL	7
46	American	.45	F	31	17	6	ALL	7
19	American	.42	F	39	16	12	ALL	7
77	American	.42	M	27	16	1	ALL	7
62	Lebanese	.41	M	43	16	9	4	5
71	American	.38	F	53	16	25	ALL	7
17	Lebanese	.35	F	53	16	30	10	7
31	Lebanese	.34	M	52	17	24	27	7
2	American	.30	F	47	16	8	ALL	7
33	Lebanese	.30	M	65	25	31	20	7
56	American	.29	M	46	17	25	38	5
30	Lebanese	.21	M	60	25	30	10	7
87	Lebanese	.08	M	40	10	11	4	5
35	Lebanese	.04	M	40	32	13	32	5
86	Lebanese	-.04	F	33	11	11	3	5
29	Lebanese	-.23	M	38	19	11	.5	7
58	Lebanese	-.46	M	70	7	35	2	4

are not pure, they are however significant in that they further provide evidence of the tendency of Americans to endorse this factor and for the Lebanese to be reluctant to do so.

Another noteworthy observation is a closer look at the two lowest correlation coefficients by American participants. We notice that participants # 56 and # 2 mingle somewhat with Lebanese loadings and this does not appear to be a coincidence. In fact, both these participants are individuals who *married* a Lebanese person.

With regards to Factor II loadings (Table 12), the trends identified above are not reversed, as might have been expected. But while the two nationalities have correlation coefficients that are fairly similar, this is not to say that a pattern is not noticeable. For example, four of the five highest non-pure loadings are from Lebanese participants. Furthermore, participant # 56 is the highest by an American and is also the Q sort of one of the Americans who married to a Lebanese.

Table 12: Non-pure loadings: Factor 2 coefficients and demographic characteristics (N = 19).

Subject	*Nationality*	*F2*	Sex	*Age*	*Educ. (Yrs)*	*Yrs Marrie*	*Yrs In US*	*Income level*
31	Lebanese	.56	M	52	17	24	27	7
30	Lebanese	.50	M	60	25	30	10	7
62	Lebanese	.47	M	43	16	9	4	5
56	American	.42	M	46	17	25	38	5
17	Lebanese	.39	F	53	16	30	10	7
19	American	.38	F	39	16	12	ALL	7
76	American	.34	F	26	22	1	ALL	7
2	American	.33	F	47	16	8	ALL	7
82	American	.31	M	57	15	18	ALL	6
35	Lebanese	.30	M	40	32	13	32	5
77	American	.28	M	27	16	1	ALL	7
33	Lebanese	.26	M	65	25	31	20	7
58	Lebanese	.21	M	70	7	35	2	4
86	Lebanese	.19	F	33	11	11	3	5
74	American	.18	M	55	21	29	ALL	7
87	Lebanese	.17	M	40	10	11	4	5
29	Lebanese	.13	M	38	19	11	.5	7
71	American	.13	F	53	16	25	ALL	7
46	American	.12	F	31	17	6	ALL	7

A closer look at the response pattern of the 19 non-pure loadings also leads to some interesting patterns regarding gender. While women seem indistinguishable in their endorsement of factors I and II, men tend to congregate at bottom of Factor I table and atop of Factor II table. Based on these results, we can conclude that, at some level, men are more likely to endorse the 'Lebanese' factor, a trend that was not observed in our result interpretations of the previous section.

Analysis of Variance

The next step in our data analysis and interpretation was to conduct a series of Analyses of Variance (ANOVAS) to examine differences in total 'western' and total 'eastern' scores between Americans and Lebanese. This involved comparing the average scores of Lebanese and Americans on all items that were believed to represent a 'western' view of marriage; and comparing the average scores of Lebanese and Americans on all items that were believed to represent an 'eastern' view of marriage (Table 12). An ANOVA was also used to compare scores of men and women irrespective of nationality, for both the 'western' and 'eastern' statements as well as other variable of interest.[6] Determining if an item is considered a 'western' or 'eastern' one was based on the same three sources that were used to determine which Q statements to develop (literature on Eastern and Western beliefs about marriage; existing marital quality scales;

[6] The analysis for 'western' items has been omitted here for it produces results identical to the 'eastern' items analysis. This is because scores are derived from the Q sort, and the total for each participant is always the same (336, if 1 to 11 scale is used; 0, if -5 to +5 scale is used). To use the example of gender, men have a 'western' score 2.71 *lower* than women (178.20 vs. 180. 21), and have an 'eastern' score 2.71 *higher* on the 'eastern' items, (157.80 vs. 155. 09) yielding identical standard deviations and significant levels for both analyses.

and focus groups). The two lists of items that were separated on the basis of cultural values can be found in Appendices H and I.

For convenience purposes, we transformed the -5 to + 5 scale used in Q into a scale that varied from 1 to 11, with 1 being the least important value and 11 the most important value. For example, a '-1' became a '5', and a '+4' became a 10. In both the 'western' and 'eastern' analyses, a high score indicated an endorsement of the value expressed in that statement.

Comparing Americans and Lebanese scores on the 30 'eastern' items yielded a significant difference between the two groups F (1, 88) = 9.96, $p < .05$ in the expected direction. Thus, results indicated that Americans were significantly less 'eastern' in their marital beliefs than the Lebanese. When teasing apart the scores of the two Lebanese groups, the differences remained similar with Americans being significantly less 'eastern' than both the newer Lebanese immigrants F (1, 58) = 11.45, $p = .01$ and the older immigrants F (1, 58) = 5.83, $p < .05$. No difference was found between the two Lebanese groups.

An analysis of variance comparing men and women's scores on Eastern values did not yield significant differences. This was the case when collapsing participants of all three groups (US, newer immigrant, older immigrants) and when looking at gender differences within each group. Interaction tests were also insignificant, indicating that men and women trends were similar, irrespective of nationality or length of stay in the

Table 13: 'Eastern' scores: descriptive and inferential statistics for Sample (N = 90).

Variable	*Group*	*Mean**	*SD*	*P value*
Nationality	US (N=30)	148.20	12.52	.004
	Older Immigrants (N=30)	157.53	17.07	
	Newer Immigrants (N=30)	163.60	21.55	
Gender	Male (N=45)	157.80	22.07	.480
	Female (N =45)	155.09	13.88	
Age	Under 40 (N =37)	157.78	18.33	.567
	40 and over (N=53)	155.55	18.55	
Income	Low: $45,000 or less (N=22)	162.36	20.98	.082
	High: $45,000 or more (N=68)	154.53	17.20	
Education	High school or less (N=13)	168.23	17.82	.016
	Some college (N=38)	157.34	16.17	
	Some graduate School (N=39)	151.64	19.09	
Years married	0 – 4 years (N=19)	158.47	16.43	.258
	5 – 10 years (N=22)	150.14	15.12	
	11-20 years (N=20)	161.00	20.66	
	20 + years (N=29)	156.76	19.76	

* A higher mean indicates more 'Eastern' values.

United States. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in 'eastern' marital values scores based on age, years of marriage or religion. A marginally significant difference for income emerged F (2, 87) = 3.09, p = .08 with participants who have more money being less 'eastern.' A significant effect of education was found with participants with a college degree or higher reporting significantly less 'eastern' values in their marital beliefs irrespective of nationality or years lived in the US F (2, 87) = 4.35, $p < .05$.

CHAPTER 4

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The first aim of the current study was to explore cultural differences in marriage by comparing the marital values of Europeans Americans with the values of Lebanese or Lebanese Americans. Numerous studies have looked at romantic differences between eastern and western cultures in general but studies that compare how the meaning of marriage might vary with culture and nationality are non-existent. Because marriage is ubiquitous in all human societies, it was imperative that research be conducted that addressed cultural variations of marital values with more specificity.

A second aim of the current study was to address another lacuna in marital research. Because cultural values are implicit in what we measure, available scales that measure marriage-related values have tended to be ethnocentrically biased. More specifically, popular scales that measure marriage-related constructs have been developed in the US and, as such, incorporate values that represent a viewpoint that is westerly-driven. Many researchers have targeted this issue in the last decade; conducting studies that show love and romance are western values. However, the conclusions derived from such research have tended to dichotomize cultures into a simplistic east vs. west perspective of love and marriage, in effect ignoring the idea that some aspect of love and romance are cross-cultural while others are not. Our aim therefore was to show that scales that measure marriage-related constructs need to be comprehensive and as such incorporate values that represent multicultural perspectives. In order to achieve this goal, a unique methodological approach was utilized. Using Q sort, a method of factor analyzing people instead of tests, individuals chose for themselves what they consider to

be valuable in marriage. This insured *persons* endorse values they believe are important in marriage rather than select values from preexisting scales that can be biased in origin.

In the analysis, clear similarities and differences between the two cultures emerged. Based on different loadings on two separate factors (in effect delineating two different value systems) we were able to show that a large majority of Americans (2/3 of the sample) loaded on Factor I, a factor which delineates a system of belief that values romanticism and intimacy as a prime component of marriage. Another marital value piece for this group was the strong belief that marriage is essentially a relationship between two individuals, the fate of which solely depends on the decision-making process of the dyad. Thus independence (or 'couple individualism') was also an essential value in marriage. This view was shared by a smaller proportion (1/4 of the sample) of the Lebanese, those who were more educated than their other compatriots.

For the majority of the Lebanese (58 %) and a single American (3 %) marriage was also cherished for its romantic and intimate aspects, as revealed in the results observed for Factor II loadings. Thus, what has often been described as a western value (i.e., courtship and romantic love) was found in this study to be a cross-cultural value as the Lebanese clearly agreed that it is an essential value in marriage. Those who loaded on Factor II, while endorsing notions of romanticism, also valued the important role of family in relation to marriage. More specifically, they found it essential that their parents have a say in their marriage, both through participation in choosing a marital partner and through contribution with decisions within the marriage. This finding confirmed Josef's work with Arab families living in Lebanon that perception of self cannot be disassociated from that of relatives of blood because of a belief that fluid boundaries exist between

family members (Josef, 1993a). In connection to this concept was the finding that Factor II endorsers deemed marriage to be of no value if no children were produced (an idea strongly rejected by the Americans and the more educated Lebanese). In that regard, the physical union of a couple is essentially aimed at achieving that objective. Furthermore, a factor analysis showed that the majority of the Lebanese attach no value to *non*-relatives of blood – e.g., friends – in terms of such relationship providing a supportive role in their marriage.

Another relevant finding was the response patterns of the remaining participants who did not define either factor (1/5 of the sample). While the evidence derived from their responses is weaker than what has just been discussed - since correlation coefficients were not 'pure' – results did lend further credence to the finding that Factor I responses tend to reflect a western perspective of marriage. More specifically, Americans in this group had the six highest correlation coefficients and the Lebanese the six lowest. Mixed results were found regarding Factor II, with both nationalities having high and low correlations.

The second hypothesis, stating that men and women will differ in their perception of marital values, was not confirmed. A Q sort analysis did not reveal differences between men and women in selecting one of the two extracted factors. This lack of differences was also found in an analysis of variance were men and women scored similarly in both the 'western' and 'eastern' items. With regards to the Lebanese sample, no differences between men and women were found in their perceptions of marriage, irrespective of whether they were newer or older immigrants. This disproved the hypothesis that women tend to embrace the host culture faster than men would. A

possible explanation for this finding was that many Lebanese women who have immigrated to the US chose not to work and thus were not given much opportunity to mingle with the host culture and adopt its values more readily than men, as the literature on acculturation suggests. The evidence that Lebanese women who participated in this study did not work is not backed by quantitative or qualitative data but rather by informal conversations with female participants.

With the Q sort analysis suggesting that American women do not value the relational and communal aspect of love (e.g., the value of interconnectedness) more than men do, it is possible that gender might not be such a determining factor, as it has many times been suggested, in detailing a western perception of marriage. However, the small sample size (15 men; 15 women) might have made it difficult to find a gender difference. More research with a larger sample size is therefore needed to determine whether measuring marital values using Q sort methodology provides new evidence that gender views of marriage are more similar than previously expected or that the finding was due to a lack of statistical power to detect differences.

In terms of this study's limitations there are two main areas of concern that would justify one interpreting the findings cautiously. First, demographic characteristics of participants were not well matched; rendering a comparison of groups that don't match in age, income and years of marriage lacking some validity. Future studies need to insure that samples do match in demographic characteristics of importance. Secondly, and probably more importantly, involves shortcomings of temporal and financial limitations of this study. A Q sort analysis typically includes a follow-up interview with each participant to give each person the opportunity to lay out more clearly and more

completely why they chose to rate a statements in such way or other. No such interviews were possible given the limitations stated above. This is indeed a concern because English was not the native language of the Lebanese participants (since they were all first generation, foreign-born immigrants) and they might have been limited in their understanding of a statement's meaning. This is particularly problematic when statements have not been pre-tested on such a population and have been used for the first time as is the case of the 56 statements that comprised this study. To counter this problem, it is therefore important that future studies on marital values using Q methodology provide the opportunity for participants to explain or expand their thoughts on the choice they made. For after all, the purpose of using Q was to attempt capturing "the person as a whole" and any interpretation of data without giving the opportunity for additional disclosure about why one rated a statement in a particular way will be incomplete.

In terms of overall conclusions, some important observations and recommendations can be derived from the current study. First, we have been able to show that current marital scales do not reflect marital values that may differ across cultures. It is therefore important for future scale to incorporate items that represent the full range of possible marital values. Second, we have demonstrated that marital scales must be culturally sensitive as evidenced by differences in value systems between the Lebanese and American marriage culture. Most prominent amongst the values identified to be culture-specific that need to be included in future scales are the importance of having children; the central role of parents in marital decisions; and the need to respect and honor family traditions.

A few final observations are worthy of mention. Regarding the findings delineated above, it is important to note that this study has clearly shown that different cultures may share similar marital beliefs in one regard; and disagree in other regards. In specific, we have shown that European Americans and Lebanese or Lebanese Americans share similar beliefs regarding the importance of love and intimacy in marriage but disagree on the extent to which marriage is a private endeavor that only involves the views of the couple. In terms of suggestions, I propose there are some central questions that need to be answered in future studies that look at marriage and culture in an 'eastern' nation. First, it would be important to know if the findings that delineated a Lebanese perspective on marriage can be generalized to a larger cultural group of similar beliefs such as that of Arabs. Second, and probably more importantly, is the extent to which romance and passion are important for this larger cultural group. Put differently, is love and romance as important, less important, or more important than a different set of values (such as the importance role children and parents play in marriage) that might be idiosyncratic to a particular nationality.

APPENDIX A

THE LOCKE-WALLACE MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

Instructions: Check the dot on the scale below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage.

1. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage and the scale gradually ranged on one side to those few people who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in marriage.

Very Unhappy Happy Perfectly Happy

Instructions: State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items [*6 levels, ranged from always agree to always disagree):*

2. Handling family finances

3. Matters of recreation

4. Demonstration of affection

5. Friends

6. Sex relations

7. Conventionality (right, good or proper conduct)

8. Philosophy of life

9. Ways of dealing with in-laws

10. When disagreement arises, they usually result in: Husband giving in; wife giving in; agreement by mutual give and take.

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? All of them; Some of them; Very few of them; None of them.

12. In leisure time do you generally prefer to be "on the go"; to stay at home?

13. Do you wish you had not married? Frequently; occasionally; rarely; never.

14. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would

15. Do you confide in your mate: almost never; rarely; in most things; in everything.

APPENDIX B

THE DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Instructions: Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement and disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list using the response continuum [*6 options, varies from always agree to always disagree]:*

1. Handling family finances
2. Matters of recreation
3. Religious matters
4. Demonstration of affection
5. Friends
6. Sex relations
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)
8. Philosophy of life
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws
10. Aims, goals and things believed important
11. Amount of time spent together
12. Making major decisions
13. Household decisions
14. Leisure time interests and activities
15. Career decisions

16. How often have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?

17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?

18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?

19. Do you confide in your mate?

20. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)?

21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?

22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"

23. Do you kiss your mate? Every day; almost every day; occasionally; rarely; never.

24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? [from ll of them to None of them.

Instructions: How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate/ [6 levels, from never to more often than once a day]

25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas

26. Laugh together

27. Calmly discuss something

28. Work together on a project

Instructions: Indicate if either below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks.

29. Being too tired for sex

30. Not showing love.

APPENDIX C

MARITAL QUALITY INDEX

Instructions:

Indicate the level of agreement or disagreement ranging from "very strong disagreement "(1) to "very strong agreement" (7)

1. We have a good marriage

2. My Relationship with my partner is very stable

3. Our marriage is strong

4. My relationship with my partner makes me happy

5. I really feel like "part of a team" with my partner

Instructions:
6.: Indicate the point which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, in your marriage... The scale gradually increases on the right side for those who experience extreme joy in marriage (10) and decrease on the left for those who are extremely unhappy (1).

APPENDIX D

MARITAL ATTITUDE SCALE

Instructions: Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding marriage. (Strongly agree; agree; disagree; strongly disagree).

1- People should marry

2- I have little confidence that my marriage will be a success

3- People should stay married to their spouses for the rest of their lives

4- Most couples are either unhappy in their marriage or are divorced

5- I will be satisfied when I get married

6- I am fearful of marriage

7- I have doubts about marriage

8- People should only get married if they are sure that it will last forever

9- People should feel very cautious about entering into a marriage

10- Most marriages are unhappy situations

11- Marriage is only a legal contract

12- Marriage is a sacred act

13- Most marriages aren't equal partnerships

14- most people have to sacrifice too much in marriage

15- Because half of all marriages end in divorce, marriage seems futile

16- If I divorce I would probably remarry

17- When people don't get along, I believe they should divorce

18- I believe a relationship can be just as strong without having to go through the marriage ceremony

19- My lifelong dream includes a happy marriage

20- There is no such thing as a happy marriage

21- Marriage restricts individuals from achieving their goals

22- People weren't meant to stay to stay in one relationship for their entire lives

23- Marriage provides companionship that is missing from other types of relationships.

APPENDIX E

Q SORT STATEMENTS

1- A married couple should be financially independent from extended family

2- It is important that parents have a say in who their son or daughter marry

3- If I compromise with my spouse this means I am disloyal to my own values or beliefs.

4- It is not appropriate to display physical affection to one's spouse in front of others.

5- While having friends is important in marriage, I find it more valuable to have close relationships with relatives.

6- I can still be happy in my marriage even if my partner is of a different religion

7- Married folks should respect family traditions even thought they might not always agree with some of them.

8- Leisure time between spouses is best when shared with other close relatives.

9- I don't care if my spouse is highly educated; what really matters is that we love each other.

10- For a marriage to be of real value, it must be complemented with children.

11- Sexual intimacy is important in marriage because it allows husband and wife to have children and expand their families.

12- More than anything else, romance is important in marriage.

13- It is important for a married couple to share goals and beliefs independently of those of the extended family.

14- In marriage, I rely on my friends more than my relatives. After all, I was free to chose my friends but not free to chose my relatives.

15- I don't care about how much money my spouse has. I married for love not for money.

16- Even in marriage, there are some things that I still keep private from my spouse.

17- In-laws play a really important role in the life of a married couple.

18- An older sibling's opinion is important in making decision about marriage.

19- For my marriage to be valuable, I need to feel it is unique.

20- I don't see the big dealing in kissing; I don't think it is that important in marriage

21- I wouldn't stay in an unhappy marriage just because it is stable.

22- My friends play an important supporting role in my marriage

23- When you marry someone, you also marry their family.

24- In marriage, spouses should feel deeply connected – as if they are soul mates.

25- I don't think romance between husband and wife is a really important aspect of their relationship.

26- A marriage that includes regular sexual activity is important to maintaining a solid bond between husband and wife.

27- For spouses to be close, it is important that they confide in each other.

28- If husband and wife want to be happy, there relationship must be a passionate one.

29- My spouse and I are comfortable displaying physical affection in front of others.

30- A stable marriage is more important than a happy marriage.

31- A happy marriage does not need to feel unique.

32- I f my spouse had a 'bad' reputation, it would be a blow to our marriage.

33- It is hard to manage or conceive of a marriage between spouses of different religions.

34- There are many factors that go into finding the 'right' partner so I don't think finding a 'soul mate' is enough to ensure a happy marriage.

35- In marriage, it is important for spouses to maintain physical contact such as kissing.

36- Family honor is an outdated value. I am only interested in honoring the vows of my marriage.

37- It is important that my spouse and I spend a good deal of 'alone time' together

38- For marriage to succeed, spouses need only be committed to each other.

39- It is OK to follow a family tradition as long as it is in harmony with spouses' beliefs.

40- In marriage, husband and wife should have similar levels of education.

41- It is better if the goals and beliefs of a couple match those of their close relatives.

42- It is hard for me to imagine having values that are independent from those of my parents and other close relatives

43- For spouses to be close it is equally important that they disclose information to themselves as it is to significant others.

44- Passion is not the most important aspect of a husband-wife relationship.

45- I don't care what others think of my spouse's reputation. What matters is what I think of her/him.

46- Honor means more than just 'defending' my spouse. It means defending the beliefs and values of both of our extended families.

47- In marriage I think it is more important that spouses spend time together in the company of other relatives than spend it on their own.

48- Marriage means commitment to both your spouse and his/her family.

49- I value leisure alone with my spouse more than leisure with a group.

50- I don't think parents should have a say in who you marry.

51- I think it is acceptable that every now and then spouses rely on their relatives for financial support.

52- You don't have to have children to be happy in marriage

53- I think how much money one's spouse has is important. 'Marrying up' is often a gain.

54- My relatives play an important supporting role in my marriage.

55- You can't just say "I give as much as I take" in marriage because spouses must sometimes sacrifice.

56- Spouses should value the opinion of their older sibling(s) in marriage matters.

APPENDIX F

AMERICAN-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SCALE – SAMPLE STATEMENTS

This questionnaire attempts to understand some experiences of people from different countries (i.e., international students, non-immigrant professionals, permanent residents, naturalized citizens, second generation immigrants, etc.) living in the United States.

Please check the appropriate blank. Check only one blank per question, the one that you think describes you the best.

1. the language(s) I speak well

    1. English only
    2. Mostly English, some my first language (mother tongue)
    3. English and my first language equally well
    4. Mostly my first language, some English
    5. My first language only

2. When I am with people from my country I speak

    1. English only
    2. Mostly English, some my first language/national language
    3. English and my first language/national language equally
    4. Mostly my first language/national language, some English
    5. My first language/national language only

3. Friends with whom I am close are

    1. Americans only
    2. Mostly Americans, some people from my country
    3. Americans and people from my country equally
    4. Mostly people from my country, some Americans
    5. People from my country only

4. When I think, my ideas and images best operate

    1. In English only
    2. Mostly in English, some in my first language
    3. In English and my first language equally
    4. Mostly in my first language, some in English

Mark each of the following statements according to how much you agree or disagree with it. There is no right or wrong answer. The best answer is your personal opinion. Please express what you actually believe to be true rather than what you wish were true. If you do not have a definite opinion about a statement, choose a degree of agreement or disagreement that comes closest with what you think. Pleas respond to every statement. The numbers 6. 5 4. 3. 2. and 1 stand for the following:

6. Agree Strongly
5. Agree
4. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
2. Disagree
1. Disagree strongly

5. Americans try to fit me into the stereotypes that they have about my nationality group

6. I find Americans overly concerned about their personal needs

7. I find that when I am with a group of Americans, the Americans almost always talk to each other and ignore me.

8. I believe Americans are only interest in me on a surface level (e.g., my national style of dress or when I came into this country).

9. I prefer American music, films, dances, and entertainment to those of my country of origin.

10. I feel I am not fully accepted in organizations (e.g., private social clubs, professional associations, fraternities, sororities, or physical fitness clubs) which have a majority of American members.

11. Americans are too assertive and verbal for my liking.

APPENDIX G

Q SORT FACTOR MATRIX (UNROTATED)

Part.	*Factor I*	*Factor II*	*Factor III*	*Factor IV*	*Factor V*	*Factor VI*	*Factor VII*
1	.49	.20	-.09	.10	-.35	.05	.00
2	.44	.03	-.07	.23	.10	.02	.22
3	.66	.31	-.06	-.20	-.12	.04	.14
4	.53	.17	-.18	-.01	.13	.02	.24
5	.49	.54	-.02	.23	.15	.08	.04
6	.70	.23	-.22	-.34	-.10	.06	.07
7	.70	-.23	-.05	-.12	.18	.02	.02
8	.68	-.29	-.13	-.12	.07	.03	.20
9	.41	.42	-.02	.11	-.26	.06	-.18
10	.51	-.22	.24	.28	-.07	.05	.07
11	.33	.32	.03	-.34	.00	.05	-.18
12	.65	-.08	-.13	.10	.05	.01	.17
13	.40	.45	.08	-.04	.04	.04	.15
14	.49	.26	.24	-.08	-.13	.03	.04
15	.46	.13	.07	.16	-.07	.01	.10
16	.51	-.34	.20	-.18	.19	.05	-.08
17	.52	.03	-.03	-.06	.05	.00	.24
18	.46	.33	.00	-.08	.04	.02	.13
19	.57	-.01	.44	.08	-.17	.05	.09
20	.63	.15	.18	.22	.19	.03	-.20
21	.71	-.34	.09	-.18	.03	.04	-.05
22	.64	.03	.04	.01	.04	.00	-.07
23	.56	-.24	-.19	.22	.03	.04	-.29
24	.30	.36	-.13	.32	-.19	.07	-.17
25	.47	.21	.02	.07	.05	.01	-.25
26	.33	.59	-.05	-.12	.00	.09	-.02
27	.71	-.24	.17	-.24	.06	.03	.01
28	.28	.26	.00	.14	-.06	.02	.23

Part.	*Factor I*	*Factor II*	*Factor III*	*Factor IV*	*Factor V*	*Factor VI*	*Factor VII*
29	-.07	.25	.54	.36	.23	-.14	.11
30	.50	.21	-.41	.14	.30	.07	-.20
31	.65	.18	.27	.02	.42	.06	.03
32	.68	-.09	-.07	.25	.22	.02	-.06
33	.39	-.01	-.22	.35	.21	.05	-.10
34	.32	-.45	-.21	.32	-.11	.09	.15
35	.24	.19	.56	.33	.37	.14	.16
36	.67	-.17	.05	.16	-.12	.02	-.05
37	.49	-.41	.08	.29	-.30	.09	.11
38	.63	-.31	-.41	-.14	.07	.07	.06
39	.74	-.19	-.43	.10	.06	.06	.00
40	.73	-.16	.01	-.36	-.12	.04	-.12
41	.70	-.30	.11	-.08	.00	.02	.07
42	.40	-.19	.06	.10	-.14	.02	-.27
43	.35	.38	.08	-.15	.10	.04	-.02
44	.61	.47	-.14	-.11	.12	.06	-.05
45	.58	.19	.09	-.22	-.23	.03	.01
46	.41	-.22	.38	-.01	.24	.06	.04
47	.68	-.26	.14	.07	-.18	.03	-.08
48	.47	-.52	.20	.02	.11	.08	-.26
49	.57	-.40	.12	-.16	.04	.05	-.15
50	.56	.33	-.16	-.13	.18	.04	.04
51	.68	-.11	.11	.05	.25	.02	.27
52	.65	.18	-.13	.19	-.26	.04	.04
53	.77	.09	-.09	-.03	-.16	.01	.11
54	.55	-.38	.07	.15	-.35	.08	.08
55	.64	-.43	-.16	.12	-.08	.06	.03
56	.50	.09	.16	-.11	-.23	.02	-.11
.60	.36	.18	.13	.15	.04	.07	.01
58	-.19	.47	.31	.43	.28	-.15	-.10
59	.56	.27	-.04	-.06	-.07	.02	-.27
60	.41	.42	-.20	.06	-.04	.05	-.05
61	.47	.42	-.16	.00	-.25	.07	-.06

Part.	*Factor I*	*Factor II*	*Factor III*	*Factor IV*	*Factor V*	*Factor VI*	*Factor VII*
62	.62	.05	-.27	-.10	.12	.02	-.33
63	.57	.18	-.02	-.17	.03	.01	-.13
64	.49	-.49	.28	-.05	-.10	.08	-.03
65	.61	-.42	.23	-.08	-.23	.08	.04
66	.68	-.13	-.25	-.16	.18	.03	-.11
67	.56	-.42	.06	.28	.11	.06	.15
68	.61	-.31	-.17	.17	.10	.04	.12
69	.50	.19	.22	-.17	.18	.03	-.07
70	.50	-.26	-.12	-.10	.05	.02	-.37
71	.37	-.17	.38	-.02	.18	.05	-.29
72	.78	-.17	-.21	-.16	.04	.02	.10
73	.71	-.32	-.11	.05	-.05	.03	.00
74	.47	-.20	-.36	.10	.15	.05	.18
75	.69	-.25	.29	-.22	.07	.04	-.02
76	.64	-.15	.42	-.21	-.10	.06	.17
77	.49	-.09	.31	-.07	-.16	.03	.31
78	.62	-.28	.20	.22	.02	.04	.10
79	.69	-.19	-.17	-.22	.05	.03	.03
80	.62	.13	.17	.11	.16	.01	.08
81	.43	.32	.12	-.18	-.08	.03	.13
82	.57	-.12	-.20	.24	-.18	.04	-.23
83	.61	30	.16	.16	.16	.04	.12
84	.44	.30	-.02	.02	.00	.02	.09
85	.25	.42	.06	.15	.16	.05	-.06
86	.10	.17	-.29	-.01	-.11	.03	.13
.18	.17	.07	-.20	-.12	.11	.02	.23
88	.63	-.23	-.17	-.08	.21	.03	-.03
89	.47	.27	.11	-.11	-.29	.05	-.27
90	.44	.38	.21	.17	-.20	.07	-.09

APPENDIX H

LEBANESE/ARAB-DERIVED Q SORT STATEMENTS

It is important that parents have a say in who their son or daughter marry

It is not appropriate to display physical affection to one's spouse in front of others.

While having friends is important in marriage, I find it more valuable to have close relationships with relatives.

Married folks should respect family traditions even thought they might not always agree with some of them.

Leisure time between spouses is best when shared with other close relatives.

For a marriage to be of real value, it must be complemented with children.

Sexual intimacy is important in marriage because it allows husband and wife to have children and expand their families.

In-laws play a really important role in the life of a married couple.

An older sibling's opinion is important in making decision about marriage.

I don't see the big dealing in kissing; I don't think it is that important in marriage

When you marry someone, you also marry their family.

I don't think romance between husband and wife is a really important aspect of their relationship.

A stable marriage is more important than a happy marriage.

A happy marriage does not need to feel unique.

If my spouse had a 'bad' reputation, it would be a blow to our marriage.

It is hard to manage or conceive of a marriage between spouses of different religions.

There are many factors that go into finding the 'right' partner so I don't think finding a 'soul mate' is enough to ensure a happy marriage.

In marriage, husband and wife should have similar levels of education.

It is better if the goals and beliefs of a couple match those of their close relatives.

It is hard for me to imagine having values that are independent from those of my parents and other close relatives

For spouses to be close it is equally important that they disclose information to themselves as it is to significant others.

Passion is not the most important aspect of a husband-wife relationship.

Honor means more than just 'defending' my spouse. It means defending the beliefs and values of both of our extended families.

In marriage I think it is more important that spouses spend time together in the company of other relatives than spend it on their own.

Marriage means commitment to both your spouse and his/her family.

I think it is acceptable that every now and then spouses rely on their relatives for financial support.

I think how much money one's spouse has is important. 'Marrying up' is often a gain.

My relatives play an important supporting role in my marriage.

You can't just say "I give as much as I take" in marriage because spouses must sometimes sacrifice.

Spouses should value the opinion of their older sibling(s) in marriage matters.

APPENDIX I

US-DERIVED Q SORT STATEMENTS

A married couple should be financially independent from extended family

If I compromise with my spouse this means I am disloyal to my own values or beliefs

I can still be happy in my marriage even if my partner is of a different religion

I don't care if my spouse is highly educated; what really matters is that we love each other.

More than anything else, romance is important in marriage.

It is important for a married couple to share goals and beliefs independently of those of the extended family.

In marriage, I rely on my friends more than my relatives. After all, I was free to chose my friends but not free to chose my relatives.

I don't care about how much money my spouse has. I married for love not for money.

Even in marriage, there are some things that I still keep private from my spouse.

For my marriage to be valuable, I need to feel it is unique.

I wouldn't stay in an unhappy marriage just because it is stable.

My friends play an important supporting role in my marriage

In marriage, spouses should feel deeply connected – as if they are soul mates.

A marriage that includes regular sexual activity is important to maintaining a solid bond between husband and wife.

For spouses to be close, it is important that they confide in each other.

If husband and wife want to be happy, there relationship must be a passionate one.

My spouse and I are comfortable displaying physical affection in front of others.

In marriage, it is important for spouses to maintain physical contact such as kissing.

Family honor is an outdated value. I am only interested in honoring the vows of my marriage.

It is important that my spouse and I spend a good deal of 'alone time' together

For marriage to succeed, spouses need only be committed to each other.

It is OK to follow a family tradition as long as it is in harmony with spouses' beliefs.

I don't care what others think of my spouse's reputation. What matters is what I think of her/him.

I value leisure alone with my spouse more than leisure with a group.

I don't think parents should have a say in who you marry.

You don't have to have children to be happy in marriage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abudabbeh, Nuha (1996). Arab Families. In: M. McGoldrick, J. Giordano & J.K. Pearce (Eds.), *Ethnicity and Family Therapy, 2nd edition* (pp.333-346). New York: Guilford Press.

Ammar, H. (1966). *Growing up in an Egyptian Village; Silwa, Province of Aswan.* New York, Octagon Books.

Barakat, H. (1993). *The Arab World: Society Culture and State.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bateson, G., Jackson, D.D. & Haley, J. (1956). Toward a theory of schizophrenia. *Journal of Behavioral Science, 1,* 251-264.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N.R., Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind.* New York: Basic Books

Berry, J.W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46,* 5-34.

Berry, J.W. (1998). *Acculturation* and health: Theory and research. In: S.S. Kazarian & D.R. Evans (Eds), *Cultural clinical psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 39-57). New York: Oxford University Press.

Blair, S.L. & Lichter, D.T. (1991). Measuring the division of household labor: Gender segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 12,* 91-113.

Braiker, H. & Kelley, H. (1979). Conflict in the development of close relationships. In: R.L. Burgess & T.L. Huston (eds.), *Social Exchange in Developing Relationships* (pp. 135-168). New York: Academic Press.

Braaten, E.B. & Rosen. L.A. (1998). Development and validation of the Marital Attitude Scale. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 29,* 83-92.

Broman, C. L. (2005). Marital Quality in Black and White Marriages. *Journal of Family Issues, 26,* 431-441.

Brown, S.R. (1971). The forced-free distinction in Q technique. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 8,* 283-287.

Brown, S.R. (1980). *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Brown, S. R. (1985). Comment on "A new Q too?" *Operant Subjectivity, 8,* 54-62.

Buda, R. & Elsayed-Elkhouly, S. M. (1998). Cultural differences between Arabs and Americans: Individualism-collectivism revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29,* 487-492.

Burt, C. (1937). Correlations between persons. *British Journal of Psychology, 28,* 59-96.

Cattell R.. (1944). A note on correlation clusters and cluster search methods. *Psychometrika, 9,* 169-184.

Chodorow, N. (1978). Mothering, object-relations, and the female oedipal configuration. *.Feminist Studies, 4,* 137-158.

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Contreras, R., Hendrick, S.S. & Hendrick, C. (1996). Perspectives on marital love and satisfaction in Mexican American and Anglo-American couples. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74,* 408-415.

Coontz, S. (1992). *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Coontz, S. (2004). The world historical transformation of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66,* 974-979.

Crane, D.R., Allgood, S.M., Larson, J.H. & Griffin, W. (1990). Assessing marital quality with distressed and nondistressed couples: A comparison and equivalency table for three frequently used measures. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52,* 87-93.

Cuellar, I, Harris, L.C. & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 2,* 199-217.

Desai, L. (1999). Relational theory in a South Asian context: An example of the dynamics of identity development. *Work in Progress 86,* 1-11.

Dion, K.K. & Dion, K. L. (1996). Cultural perspectives on romantic love. *Personal Relationships, 3,* 5-17.

Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-Analysis.*Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 233-256.

El-Solh, R. (2004). *Lebanon and Arabism: national identity and state formation.* London; NY: IB Taurus.

Farhadian, T. (1999). Families Inc: some reflections on the American family in the '80s and '90s-universals, hegemony, and drag. *Socialist Review, 27,* 49-69.

Farrell, B. (1999). *Family. The making of an idea, an institution, and a controversy in American culture.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Feldman, S. S., Mont-Reynaud, R. & Rosenthal, D.A. (1992). When East moves West: The acculturation of values of Chinese adolescents in the U.S. and Australia. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 2,* 147-173.

Felix-Ortiz, M., Newcomb, M.D. & Myers, H. (1994). A Multidimensional Measure of Cultural Identity for Latino and Latina Adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 16,* 99-115.

Felmlee, D.H. (1994). Who's on top? Power in romantic relationships. *Sex Roles, 31,* 275-295.

Fincham, F.D. & Bradbury, T. N. (1987). The assessment of marital quality: A Reevaluation. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 49,* 797-809.

Fincham, F.D., Beach, S.R.H., Kemp-Fincham, S. I. (1997). Marital quality: A new theoretical perspective. In: R. J. Sternberg, M. Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in Close Relationships* (pp. 275-304). New York: Guilford Press..

Fredman, N. & Sherman, R. (1987). *Handbook of measurements for marriage and family therapy.* Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Gabardi, L. Rosen, L.A. (1991). Differences between *college students from divorced and intact families. Journal* of Divorce & Remarriage, 15, 175-191.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1986). Remapping the moral domain. In: T.C. Heller, M. Sosna, D.E. Wellbery (eds.), *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought (pp.237-252).* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gillis, J.R. (2004). Marriages of the Mind. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66,* 988-991.

Glenn, N.D. (1996). Values, Attitudes, and the State of American Marriage. In: D. Popenoe, D. Elshtain, J. Bethke, & D. Blankenhorn (Eds.), *Promises to Keep: Decline and Renewal of Marriage in America* (pp. 15-33). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gonzalez-Reigosa, F. & Kaminsky, H. (1989). Greek homosexuality, Greek narcissism, Greek culture: The invention of Apollo. *Psychohistory Review, 17,* 149-181.

Goode, W. J. (1959). The theoretical importance of love. *American Sociological Review, 24,* 38-47.

Goodsell, W. A. (1935). *History of Marriage and the Family.* New York, Macmillan.

Gottman, J. M. & Notarius, C.I. (2002). Marital research in the 20th century and a research agenda for the 21st century. *Family Process, 41,* 159-197.

Graves, T.D. (1967). Acculturation, access, and alcohol in a tri-ethnic community. *American Anthropologist, 69,* 306-321.

Grebler, L., Moore, J.W. & Guzman, R.C. (1970). *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority.* New York: The free press.

Hakim, G. (1966). The economic basis for Lebanese polity. In: L. Binder (ed.), *Politics in Lebanon* (pp. 57-68). New York, Wiley.

Hall, J.A., Irish, J.T., Roter, D.L., Ehrlich, C.M. & Miller, C.T. (1994). Satisfaction, gender, and communication in medical visits. *Medical Care, 32,* 1216-1231.

Hamady, S. (1960). *Temperament and Character of the Arabs.* New York, Twayne Publishers.

Henry, I., Amara, M. & Al-Tauqi. M. (2003). Sport, Arab nationalism and the Pan-Arab Games. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 38,* 295-310.

Hill, R.J. (1951). Attitude toward marriage. Unpublished master's thesis. Stanford University, CA.

Hobart, C.W. (1958). The incidence of romanticism during courtship. *Social Forces, 36,* 362-367.

Hofstede, G. (1984). The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review, 9,* 389-398.

Hui, C. H. & Triandis, H.C. (1986). Individualism-Collectivism: a study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2,* 225-248.

Huston, T.L. & Robins, E. (1982). Conceptual and methodological issues in close Relationships. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 44,* 901-925.

Hyde, A., Howlett, E., Brady, D. (2005). The focus group method: Insights from focus

group interviews on sexual health with adolescents. *Health Promotion International, 20,* pp. 334-341.

Ibrahim, S. E. (1996). *Management and Mismanagement of Diversity: The Case of Ethnic Conflict and State Building in the Arab World* (Discussion paper series No.10). Paris: UNESCO.

Ickes, W., Robertson, E., Tooke, W. & Teng G. (1986). Naturalistic social cognition: Methodology, assessment, and validation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 66-82.

Ingoldsby, B.B. (1991). The Latin American Family: Familism vs. Machismo. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 22,* 57-62.

Johnson, M. (1986). *Class & Client in Beirut: the Sunni Muslim Community and the Lebanese State, 1840-1985.* London; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Ithaca Press.

Jones, D. (1991). Enmeshment in the American Family. *Affilia, 6,* 28-44.

Jordan, J.V. & Surrey, J.L. (1986). The self-in-relation: Empathy and the mother-daughter relationship. In: T. Bernay, & D.W. Cantor (eds.), *The Psychology of Today's Woman: New Psychoanalytic Visions* (pp.81-104). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Joseph, S. (1993a). Connectivity and patriarchy among urban working-class Arab families in Lebanon. *Ethos, 21,* 452-484.

Joseph, S. (1993b). Gender and relationality among Arab families in Lebanon. *Feminist Studies, 19,* 465-186.

Joseph, S. (1999a). Introduction. In: S. Joseph (ed.), *Intimate Selving in Arab Families: Gender, Self, and Identity* (pp. 1-17). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Joseph, S. (1999b). Brother/sister relationships: Connectivity, Love, and Power in the Reproduction of Arab Patriarchy. In: S. Joseph (ed.), *Intimate Selving in Arab Families: Gender, Self, and Identity* (pp.112-136). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Joseph, S. (2000). *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Joseph S. (2004). Conceiving Family Relationships in Post-War Lebanon. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 35,* 271-293.

Kato, K. & Markus, H.R. (1993). The role of possible selves in memory. *Psychologia: An*

International Journal of Psychology in the Orient, 36, 73-83.

Keefe, S.E., Padilla, A.M. & Carlos, M.L. (1979). The Mexican-American extended family as an emotional support system. *Human Organization, 38*, 144-152.

Keefe, S.E. (1980). Personal Communities in the City: Support Networks among Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans. *Urban Anthropology, 9,* 51-74.

Keefe, S. E. (1984). Real and Ideal Extended Familism among Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans: On the Meaning of "Close" Family Ties. *Human Organization, 43,* 65-70.

Khalaf, S. (1971). Family Associations in Lebanon. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 2,* 235-250.

Kim, M. (1993). Culture-based interactive constraints in explaining intercultural strategic competence. In: R. Wiseman, L. Richard & J. Koester (eds.), *Intercultural Communication Competence* (pp. 132-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kinnaird, K.L. Gerrard, M. (1986). Premarital sexual behavior and attitudes toward marriage and divorce among young women as a function of their mothers' marital status. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 48,* 757-765.

Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism.* London: Sage.

Klat, M. & Khudr, A. (1986). Religious endogamy and consanguinity in marriage patterns in Beirut, Lebanon. *Social Biology, 33,* 138-145.

Knox, D.H. Jr. & Sporakowski, M.J. (1968). Attitudes of college students toward love. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 30,* 638-642.

Knox D., Zusman, M. E., McGinty, K. & Abowitz, D.A. (2003). Weddings: some data on college student perceptions. *College Student Journal, 37,* 197-200.

Kuo, B.C.H., & Roysircar, G. (2004). Predictors of Acculturation for Chinese Adolescents in Canada: Age of Arrival, Length of Stay, Social Class, and English Reading Ability. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32,* 143-154.

Locke, H. J. (1951). Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: a Comparison of a Divorced and a Happily Married Group. Oxford, England: Henry Holt.

Locke, H.J. & Wallace, K.M. (1959). Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage & Family Living, 21,* 251-255.

Lyons, N.P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 53,* 125-145.

Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98, 224-*253.

Markus, H.R. Mullally, P.R. & Kitayama, S. (1997). Selfways: Diversity in modes of cultural participation. In: U. Neisser & D.A. Jopling (eds.), *The Conceptnal Self in Context: Culture, Experience, Self-understanding* (pp.13-61). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Markus H.R. & Oyserman, D. (1989). Gender and thought: The role of the self-concept. In: M. Crawford & M. Gentry (eds.), *Gender and thonght: psychological perspectives* (pp.100-127). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Martinson, F. (1960). *Marriage and the American Ideal.* NY: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Matsuoka, J.K. (1990). Differential acculturation among Vietnamese refugees. *Social Work, 35,* 341-345.

Maulde-La-Clavière, R. de (1901). *The Women of the Renaissance; a Study of Feminism.* New York, G. P. Putnam's; London, S. Sonnenschein.

McGuire, W.J. & McGuire, C.V. (1987). Developmental trends and gender differences in the subjective experience of self. In: T. Honess & K.Yardley (eds.), *Self and Identity: Perspectives Across the Lifespan* (pp. 134-146). New York: Routledge.

McKeown B. & Thomas D. (1988). *Q Methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Monzo, L.D. & Rueda, R. (2006). A Sociocultural Perspective on Acculturation: Latino Immigrant Families Negotiating Diverse Discipline Practices . *Education and Urban Society, 38,* 188-203.

Mullati, L. (1995). Religious and ideological orientations and characteristics. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 26,* 11-25.

Niemann, Y.F., Romero, A.J., Arredondo, J. & Rodriguez, V. (1999). What Does It Mean to Be "Mexican"? Social Construction of an Ethnic Identity. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 21,* 47-60.

Norton, R., Montgomery, B.M. (1982). Style, content, and target components of openness. *Communication Research, 9,* pp. 399-431.

Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 45,* 141-151.

Oropesa, R. S. (1996). Normative beliefs about marriage and cohabitation: A comparison of non-Latino Whites, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 58(1),* 49-62.

Prothro, E.T. & Diab, L.N. (1974). *Changing Family Patterns in the Arab East.* Beirut: American University of Beirut.

Rancer, A., Dierks-Stewart, K.J. (1985). The influence of sex and sex-role orientation on trait argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* pp. 69-70.

Roland, A. (1980). *In Search of Self in India and Japan: Toward a Cross-Cultural Psychology.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rosenthal, D.A. (1984). Intergenerational conflict and culture: A study of immigrant and nonimmigrant adolescents and their parents. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 109,* 53-75.

Rosenthal, D.A., Bell, J., Demetriou, R. & Efklides, A. (1989). The Dynamic Nature of Ethnic Identity among Greek-Australian Adolescents. *Journal of Social Psychology, 129,* 249-258.

Rosenthal, D., Ranieri, N. & Klimidis, S. (1996). Vietnamese adolescents in Australia: Relationships between perceptions of self and parental values, intergenerational conflict, and gender dissatisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology, 31,* 81-91.

Roysircar, G. (2006). Email correspondence with Gargi Roysircar, May 12.

Sabatelli, R.M. (1988). Measurement issues in marital research: A review and critique of contemporary survey instruments. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50,* 891-915.

Sabogal, F., Marin, G., Otero-Sabogal, R. & Marin, B.V. (1987) Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't? *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9,* 397-412.

Segal, U.A. (1991). Cultural Variables in Asian Indian Families. *Families in Society, 72,* 233-241.

Seki, K., Matsumoto, D. & Imahori, T. T. (2002). The conceptualization and expression Of intimacy in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33,* 303-319.

Shweder, R.A. (1990). Cultural psychology: What is it? In: J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder

& G. Herdt (eds.) *Cultural Psychology: Essays on Comparative Human Development* (pp.1-36). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shweder, R.A. et al. (1998). The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In: D. William & R.M. Lerner (eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Volume 1: Theoretical models of human development, 4th edition* (pp.865-937). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Simic, A. & Custred, G. (1982). Modernity and the American Family: A Cultural Dilemma. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 12,* 163-172.

Simmons, C. H., Vom Kolke, A., Shimizu, H. (1986). Attitudes toward romantic love among American, German, and Japanese students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 126,* 327-336.

Simon, J.P. (1996). Lebanese families. In: M.McGoldrick, J. Giordano & J. K. Pearce (eds.), *Ethnicity and Family Therapy, 2nd edition* (pp.364-375). New York: Guilford Press.

Sinha, D. (1984). Some recent changes in the Indian family and their implications for socialization. *The Indian Journal of Social Work, 45,* 271-286.

Sodowsky, G. R.; Kwan, K.K. & Pannu, R. (1995). Ethnic identity of Asians in the United States. In: J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki & C.M. Alexander (eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 123-154). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sodowsky, G.R. & Plake, B.S. (1991). Psychometric properties of the American-International Relations Scale. *Psychological Measurement, 51,* 207-216.

Sodowsky, G.R. & Plake, B.S. (1992). A study of acculturation differences among international people and suggestions for sensitivity to within-group differences. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 71,* 53-59.

Spanier, G.B., Cole, C.L. (1976). Toward clarification and Investigation of Marital Adjustment. *International Journal of Sociology and the Family, 6,* 121 – 146.

Spanier, G. B., Lewis, R. A. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 42,* 825-839.

Spanier, G.B. (1985). Improve, Refine, Recast, Expand, Clarify - Don't Abandon. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47,* 1073-1074.

Spindler, G.D. (1955). *Sociocultural and Psychological Processes in Menomini Acculturation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sprecher, *S.* & Metts, S. (1989). Development of the 'Romantic Beliefs Scale' and examination of the effects of gender and gender-role orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6,* 387-411.

Sprecher, S., Aron, A. & Hatfield, E. (1994). Love: American style, Russian style and Japanese style. *Personal Relationships, 1,* 349-369.

Stephenson, W. (1935). Correlating persons instead of tests. *British Journal of Psychology, 26,* pp. 196-198.

Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior; Q-technique and its methodology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1961a). Scientific creed, 1961: Philosophical credo. Abductory principles. The centrality of self. *Psychological Record, 11, 1961.* pp. 1-26.

Sudarkasa, N. (1997). African American families and family values. In: H.P. Mc Adoo (ed.), *Black Families, 3rd edition* (pp. 9-40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M.A., Kurtines, W. & Aranalde, M.D. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation.*Revista Interamericana de Psicología, 12, 113-130.*

Tang, T.N. & Dion, K.L. (1999). Gender and acculturation in relation to traditionalism: Perceptions of self and parents among Chinese students. *Sex Roles, 41,* 17-29.

Terman, L. M., Buttenwieser, P., Ferguson, L. W, Johnson, W.B. & Wilson, D.P. (1938). *Psychological factors in marital happiness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thoits, P.A. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well-being: Gender and marital status comparisons. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55,* 236-256.

Tibi, B. (1981). *Arab Nationalism*: a Critical Enquiry. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1991). Intimacy expressions in three cultures: France, Japan, and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15,* pp. 29-46.

Triandis, H.C., Kashima, Y., Shimada, E. & Villareal, M. (1986). Acculturation indices as a means of confirming cultural differences. *International Journal of Psychology, 21,* 43-70.

Trost, J. (1985). Abandon Adjustment! *Journal of Marriage and Family, 4 (4),* 1072-1073.

Tucker, M.B. (2000). Marital values and expectations in context: Results from a 21-city

survey. In: L.J., Waite, C. Bachrach, M. Hindin, E. Thomson & A. Thornton (Eds.), *The Ties That Bind: Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation* (pp. 166-187). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Upadhyay, K. & Shukla, A. (1995). Identification of important dimensions of marital interaction: The Western and Eastern perspectives. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 21,* 153-165.

Wagner, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 152-172.

Wall, H.M. (1990). *Fierce Communion: Family and Community in Early America.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Westerman, P.L. (1996). *The development of self-reflection in Arab and American children.* The Catholic university of America, DC.

Wheelan, S.A. & Verdi, A.F. (1992). Differences in male and female patterns of communication in groups: A methodological artifact? *Sex Roles, 27,* 1-15.

Xia, G. (2002). *Evaluation of the use of Western instruments for assessing Chinese couples' marriage.* The University of Nebraska, Lincoln.